DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 220 SP 007 961

AUTHOR Morgart, Robert A.; And Others
TITLE Alienation in an Educational Context: The American Teacher in the Seventies?
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 94p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 1974

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Bureaucracy; Educational Responsibility; *Public Schools; *Public School Teachers; *Teacher Alienation; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Responsibility

ABSTRACT

The public school in the United States is a subsystem of the corporate infrastructure of American society and has four functions: socialization, selection, stabilization, and surplus absorption. Education, as a socializing institution, has become reified to the extent that a system of educational prerogatives embodies a reality which is separate and distinct from teachers. Because a bureaucratic structure develops a self-perpetuating institutional ethos, teachers become objects that are fitted into a school program to serve delineated purposes. This diminishes their opportunity to remain vital, compassionate, and professional. The public school teacher is an alienated worker; by altering the basic premises of the bureaucratic structure in the schools, teachers can avoid the debilitating effect of occupational sterility. (Author/HMD)

22.02

SP

ED 090220

ALIENATION IN AN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT: THE AMERICAN TEACHER IN THE SEVENTIES?

Robert A. Morgart

Gregory Mihalik

Don T. Martin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Foundations of Education

University of Pittsburgh

American Educational Research Association
Chicago, Illinois

April 18, 1974

SP007 961

CONTENT OUTLINE

1. Introduction - Alienation, Organization and the American Teacher in the 70's

2. Bureaucracy: The Organizational Context

3. Alienation: Theory, Research and Specific Sources of Alienation in Schools

4. Fear and Loathing for the Accountability Movement: A Journey into the Bureaucratic Wasteland

5. Conclusion: What Is To Be Done/An Examination of the Possibilities of Teacher Self-Management in the Schools

The labor of the teacher, as well as other modern work roles, has presented society with the most recent installment of the age old challenge concerning Man's existence: What is the meaning of work? and What is Man's relationship to work? The current quest for "answers" to these seemingly insoluble dilemmas indicates a willingness on the part of many educationists and others to at least associate work with other components of life. Unfortunately, many of these concerned individuals admonish any approach that attempts to specifically define the problem of work in the schools and its attendant features because teaching and teachers are a part of an occupational myth in American education that has reified the art and "professionalism" of teaching. To ignore or understate the significance of the interrelationships that constitute an environment of effective learning exchange "well integrated" learning environment, is to tacitly acknowledge that teachers are at best marginal members of the school staff and should receive less than equal consideration in matters of curriculum, institutional design, conditions of employment and general educational planning.

The role of work in society is not simply important because the society deems certain activities imperative to its existence, but because work is tantamount to life itself. Given the prevailing conditions of the society and the schools, it becomes meaningless to discuss the quality of life and our ideological framework unless the underlying assumptions that proscribe the structure and process of work are analyzed and redefined. While we do acknowledge that alienation may be an ontological reality for modern man, our approach to alienation in this paper will be structural. That is, we will deal with that work-related alienation which we argue, is growing in intensity for most of the occupational force - and we will

specifically concentrate on why this may be so for the majority of "knowledge-workers" in this society.

We hope to illustrate this by examining some of the relational problems inherent in modern "corporate" bureaucracy; by looking at research which has explored the correlations between work, bureaucracy and alienation and discussing some of the ramifications therein; and by looking at a specific issue in education, accountability, which we believe could lead to increasing work alienation and the de-professionalization of teachers.

We will suggest that there may be an increasing reification of the basic concepts and theories within the organizational structure of schools and that the initial movement toward more "open" organizational climates that occurred in the late 60's and early 70's seems to be caught in the ossifying web of the teacher "surplus" charade, the accountability movement, and the increasing power of the corporate-style AFT leadership of Albert Shanker.

Thus if teachers' needs remain essentially peripheral in the decision-making process determining the nature of their work roles, then it becomes easier to understand why teachers, like other workers might experience their work activities as alienating rather than as a means of self-actualization and as a means of developing their mental and emotional growth. This alienating kind of work can, of course, lead to an anti-intellectual orientation and a deadening of one's critical facilities. Ergo, the American teacher can, by the very nature of the work organization, be made ideologically safe for the classrooms.

Like most other blue and white-collar workers, then, teachers may be victims of the general regimen of factory-styled existence, albeit in brighter colors and

flavored by purportedly innovative methodologies and statistical reports of every variety and kind. If this is the case we are likely to have docile, existentially reified teachers producing docile, existentially reified workers which fit the needs of hierarchial commodity production.

Finally, we will suggest that if this work-alienation in an educational context is to be alleviated, then there will need to be a serious organizational restructuring in the schools - and, concurrently, in other workplaces as well.

We believe that the gap between "knowledge-workers" and other blue and white collar workers must be bridged; that work and education must be brought together not in the subtle affective way that now operates but in an open critical learning situation where parents, teachers, students and administrative staff become a more openly integrated part of the entire society - a society where work democratization would be as much espoused and vaunted as political democracy. Indeed we argue that there can be no political democracy without a genuine democratization of the workplace as well. Democratic self-management of the schools, then, is a concept that must become a reality if work-alienation which is a massive wall against critically conscious learning is to be minimized and overall societal democratization is to become a reality.

The study of man at work is exposed to dangerous errors if it does not rest on the study of work itself, on the principles of the unity of its several aspects, and their reciprocal relationship.

ALAIN TOURAINE

II. BUREAUCRACY: THE ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The organization of formal schooling in the United States has undergone a tremendous transformation which has radically altered the substance and motivation of the public school structure. Certain societal manifestations led to a spectacular rate of growth in the number of public schools as well as creating a greater degree of organizational complexity. Size and special administrative problems were two developments that resulted in a burgeoning class of school "executives" and a deeply entrenched pseudo-meritocratic bureaucracy. During the early years of the twentieth century, educational administration began to emerge as a distinct, separate profession within the educational structure. In analyzing the new professionalism of educational administrators, Raymond Callahan found that:

> The combination of the development of specialized graduate work in school administration, and the growing influence of business on education with the subsequent conception of education as a business, led to the idea of school administration (and especially the superintendency) as a "profession" distinct from teaching. This idea had been advanced even before 1910, but it was hardly a defensible claim as long as administrators had no specialized training. In the years after 1911 the idea of the separate profession developed as a natural corollary of the adoption of the business-industrial practices and, especially, of the adoption of the business organizational pattern to the schools.[1]

School administrators were favorably compared to business executives which lent a degree of sophistication and legitimization to the newly created brotherhood of professional educational managers. Following the formalization of the profession, educational administrators expanded their vistas and methodically organized the profession into an unreproachable institutional entity.

---

[1] Callahan, Raymond. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, p. 215-216.

The institutionalizing of the school administration was an attendant feature of the larger development that was occurring in the public school during the same period, namely bureaucratization. Given the set of circumstances (e.g., growing school populations, increasing pressure from business interests, relentless urbanization and implementation of stricter statutory requirements) which prevailed at the turn of the century, it seems quite evident that the alternatives to the bureaucratization of the public school were viewed as simply implausible or quaintly romantic. This view of public education reveals the notion that the policy of school bureaucratization was influenced by a kind of educational "manifest destiny." In looking at the motivation behind the new school organization, David Tyack suggests:

> ...one might claim that neither the elite nor the followers really had control over the processes of technology and modernization, but that both were swept up in changes which they neither understood nor directed.[2]

Irrespective of the approach or hypothesis one may use in determining the causal factors in the growth of educational bureaucracies, the undeniable fact clearly comes through that bureaucracies did indeed flourish for whatever reasons that can be established for that particular period of time. These bureaucracies were not unlike the organizational configurations found throughout the business community. Although the school bureaucrats would not have described their administrative proclivities as being oppressive, authoritarian and inflexible, they did adhere to many of the general rules of conduct and some specific appli-

---

2 Tyack, David B. "City Schools: Centralization of Control at the Turn of the Century," Building the Organizational Society. Jerry Israel, editor. New York: The Free Press, 1972, p. 69.

cations of managerial "tools" employed in industrial settings. The actions of school administrators more appropriately reflected the realities of life in the public schools during the last half of the nineteenth century. In his analysis of the emergence of bureaucracy in the public school, Michael Katz contends:

> The complexity of administration was an implicit assumption in the educational ideas of urban superintendents throughout the country, who argued that all large organizations, from industry to the army, depended for coordination on centralized professional direction by a superintending officer. The success of professional supervision, especially in the various branches of industry, indicated the need for the same type of direction in education. Supervision was deemed necessary because organizations had to be based on division of labor, which, to these superintendents, was the process underlying social development.[3]

Once the educational "planners" had established the theoretical alliance between the process and product of education and that of the industrial order, it was not long before the school setting began to resemble the factory work place. Education's business-like appearance reflected the attitudes and conventions which invariably prevail in every hierarchical structure. "Schoolmen pointed out," Katz explains:

> ...that a professionally supervised school system based on the division of labor should ideally have certain structural features and that its participants should have certain attitudes. An elaborate hierarchical structure and an explicit chain of command were necessary to keep each member working at his particular task in a responsible and coordinated fashion. At the head of the hierarchy should be one "vested with sufficient authority" to "devise plans in general and in detail" and to "keep all subordinates in their proper places and at their assigned tasks." Within the hierarchy, moreover, roles and duties should be defined clearly to

---

3 Katz, Michael B. Class, Bureaucracy and Schools. New York: Praeger, 1971, p. 67.

> avoid the possibility of conflict, and all members should give unquestioning, prompt obedience to the orders of their superiors.[4]

It seems evident from Katz's observations that the operational shortcomings and ignoble character of educational bureaucracies did not result from the actions of unscruprious mandarins of power; but, more accurately, the organizational conditions of the educational structure stemmed from the inherent nature and ethos of hierarchical organizations.

To be sure, the recent scholarly investigations[5] that have charted the historical course of educational bureaucracies are replete with insights and analyses that shed considerable light on a subject that was once considered to be esotericly insignificant. Even though these documented studies have adequately explained the social bases of this bureaucratic expansion, a more complete perspective on bureaucratic organization in the public school can be set forth by examining the processes that occur within the organization itself.

In descriptive terms, a bureaucratic organization is, by design, a structural entity that is based upon a number of underlying assumptions and a hypothetical framework. These assumptions or pre-conditions form a situational backdrop which acts as a triggering mechanism for subsequent bureaucratic implementation. "Hierarchy, large-size groups, and the specialization of functions

---

4 Katz, p. 69.

5 Katz, 1971; Spring, 1972; Karier, Violas and Spring, 1973; Tyack, 1972; and Callahan, 1962.

are necessary prerequisites to the development of a full-blown bureaucratic structure."[6] The pre-conditions that eventually lead to the establishment of a bureaucratic model are disarmingly complex and unwieldy. To reduce the complexity and bring rational order to an organizational structure, bureaucratic theory is translated into a deliberate, routinized pattern of administrative controls. According to Weber, bureaucratic organization is:

> ...from a purely technical point of view, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and is in this sense formally the most rationally known means of exercising authority over human beings. It is superior to any other form in precision, stability, in the stringency of its discipline and in its reliability. It thus makes possible a particularly high degree of calculability of results, for the heads of the organization and for those acting in relation to it. It is finally superior both in intensive efficiency and in the scope of its operation, and is formally capable of application to all kinds of administrative tasks.[7]

Weber's description of the ideal type of bureaucracy entails a formula of managerial precision and clearly delineated areas of competencies. Delimitation of specific work roles is central to the bureaucratic model. Robert Merton characterizes some of the requirements of bureaucracy as follows:

> If bureaucracy is to operate successfully, it must attain a high degree of reliability of behavior, and unusual degree of conformity with prescribed patterns of action. Hence, the fundamental importance of discipline...which can be effective only if the ideal patterns are buttressed by strong sentiments which entail devotion to one's duties, a keen sense

---

6 McGuire, Joseph W. Business and Society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963, p. 163.

7 Weber, Max. Economy and Society, G. Roth and C. Wittich, editors. New York: Bedminister Press, 1968, p. 223.

> of the limitation of one's authority and competence, and methodical performance of routine activities.[8]

The appearance that bureaucracies begin to take on from their inception is by no means accidental or simply a case of pursuing the course of least resistance. A definite structural pattern which is inherent in the construction and application of a bureaucratic model precludes the possibilities of a bureaucracy functioning as a non-authoritarian, non-hierarchical organization. Although the Weberian theory of bureaucracy does not depict bureaucratic organization as being a highly functional concept, beset by a monolithic distribution of power or facing the inevitable despair of institutional reification, there are significant tendencies whose effects cannot be underestimated. In his famous "iron law of oligarchy,"[9] Robert Michels contends that "modern large scale organizations, by their very structure, are necessarily oligarchic. This is so even if this oligarchy runs against the ideals and intentions of both leaders and led."[10] If Michels' admonition concerning the nature of large organizations (i.e., bureaucracies) is indeed valid, then one must begin to wonder about the veracity of the values and goals that are deemed appropriate by the bureaucratic "oligarchy." Blau and Meyer state:

> The popular stereotype of bureaucracy exaggerates the rigidity of formal organizations, but it is not without considerable basis in fact. One important organizational process that engenders rigidity...is the tendency, in large bureaucracies, for

---

8 Merton, Robert K. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." Reader on Bureaucracy. Gray, Hockey and Selvin, editors. New York: Free Press, 1952, p. 365.

9 Michels, Robert. Political Parties. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1962.

10 Mouzelis, Necos P. Organization and Bureaucracy. Chicago: Aldine, 1967, p. 27.

> for organizational ideologies to develop that take precedence over original goals, distort perceptions, and typically create resistance to change by sanctifying the existing state of affairs.[11]

Weber alluded to the possibility that bureaucracy could "produce the shell of a future serfdom."[12] This prospect begins to diminish the rational "effectiveness" of bureaucracy, and Israel further suggests, "...the bureaucracy no longer serves man and his needs, but becomes an independent body. Man, in this sense, will be subordinated to a rigid bureaucratic machine which has become a goal in itself."[13]

The discussion of bureaucratic organization, to this point, has centered on a generic model of bureaucracy and the possible ramifications of bureaucratization on the structure and process of a large organization. In order to place the parameters of bureaucratic organization in proper perspective, it is essential to examine some of the structural determinants that supply the external thrust and the internal meaning for a particular bureaucracy.

A bureaucracy, if it is going to demonstrate a moderate degree of administrative dexterity, must exert certain authority over the people who maintain positions in the hierarchy. This authority is an important corollary of the fundamental power theorem that contains these two features: (1) it is an aspect of a relationship between people, not an attribute of a given person; and (2) it consists of one individual's capacity to influence another to do something

---

11 Blau, Peter M. and Marshall W. Meyer. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1956, p. 50.

12 Israel, Joachim. Alienation: From Marx to Modern Sociology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971, p. 111.

13 Israel, p. 112.

that he otherwise would not do.[14] These same qualifications can be found in Robert Dahl's theory of power relationships.[15] It should be noted that power can be very quickly translated into encompassing policy determinations or more mundane directives. In highly bureaucratized organizations, Wamsley notes that, "...power or authority would tend to be hierarchic: each level would have just that amount of power necessary to carry out its responsibilities; ascendant levels in the hierarchy would have increasing power based on broader knowledge about the organization and/or greater task expertise..."[16] Administrative authority is, of course, the lubricant that permits the bureaucratic mechanism to "smoothly" perform its assigned functions and establish a repertoire of finely detailed activities. The application of such authority presupposes a kind of behavior that effectively channels individuality and non-conformity into a more facile range of activity. When one of the upper levels of a bureaucratic hierarchy sets down a particular rule or procedure, it is generally viewed as another episode in a long series of administrative constrictions because:

> When joining an organization individuals become aware that the exercise of authority is required of superiors and compliance with influence attempts based on authority is required of subordinates. It is specified behavior necessary for organizational effectiveness and is a cost of organizational membership.[17]

---

14 Jacobs, T. O. Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations. Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Organization, 1971, p. 216.

15 Dahl, Robert. "The Concept of Power." Behavioral Science, Vol. 2, July, 1957, pp. 202-203.

16 Wamsley, Gary. "Power and the Crisis of the Universities." Power in Organizations. Mayer N. Zald, editor. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970, p. 53.

17 Gibson, James L., John M. Ivancevich and James H. Donnelly, Jr. Organizations: Structure, Process, Behavior. Dallas: Business Publications, Inc., 1973, p. 290.

The "cost of organizational membership" can indeed be quite a high price to pay especially when the genuflecting individual has so little to bargain with given his relatively unimportant status in the hierarchy.

Policy decisions and regulations along with assorted decrees and statements tend to obscure the actual relationship that exists between an employee and the administrator and, more importantly, between the employee and the organization. This may seem to indicate that the "human" interaction between the employee and the administrator is secondary or inconsequential in comparison to the employee's relationship to the impersonal organization; however, it seems clear that the "typical" administrator can be best described as an extension of the organization rather than an intermediary who brings together the employee and the organization. The unfortunate result of this bureaucratic short circuiting is that the employee (lower hierarchical member) is set adrift in a sea of meaningless banalities. Mouzelis asserts, in more than a few cases, "...the individual, occupying an insignificant place in a huge organization which he cannot control or understand, becomes a cog in a machine, a well disciplined and regulated automaton with a specialized technical knowledge and a generalized ignorance and indifference as to his position and purpose in the organization..."[18] Worker ambivalence is a precursor of a more general bureaucratic malaise, but this malaise is also brought about by another organizational phenomenon, namely, adaptation. In looking at hierarchy and alienation, Frederick Thayer finds that:

> In every field of endeavor, whether the organizing of intellectual activity so as to discover and disseminate knowledge, or the

---

18 Mouzelis, p. 36.

> designing of a government agency, we use a "rational division of labor" to spell out in detail the tasks of every individual. By the very size of the phenomena which embody it, technique produces self-perpetuating organizational monstrosities which totally dehumanize the individual. Even when we speak of adapting the machine or the organization to the individual, we forget that adaptation is inevitably reciprocal; hence the individual adapts to the organization, and it swallows him.[19]

By extending Thayer's analysis to a logical conclusion, one finds, as in the Ellulian argument,[20] that the means (organization) consume those for whom it was designed to achieve an end.

Ellul's contention concerning the question of ends and means in an organization brings into sharper focus the crucial issue of work responsibilities (or areas of competencies) within the bureaucratic organization. It becomes increasingly difficult to plot the precise syllabus of duties and obligations that each member of a hierarchy assumes tacit responsibility for, but there are certain broader observations that do provide some insights into the various sets of organizational interactions. An institutional ethos usually surrounds and insulates different bureaucratic activities which is to say that the individual's conduct becomes a mere stimulus-response function. According to Israel, this ethos is based upon the fact that:

> ...bureaucratic organizations do not demand that the individual makes the decisions for which he takes responsibility. Instead they demand that he act in accordance with the organization's rules and ends, the responsibility for his conduct being assumed by the organization. Bureaucratic organizations do not demand that the individual assume responsibility for his actions, but

---

19 Thayer, Frederick C. An End to Hierarchy! An End to Competition! New York: New Viewpoints, 1973, p. 48.

20 Ellul, Jacques. The Technological Society. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.

rather that he subordinate himself and obey the rules of the organization.[21]

Clearly, the behavior exhibited by individuals in a bureaucratic organization tends more toward a kind of "organizational" Social Darwinism than toward a collective body operating with well coordinated plans and goals. Looking at a more specific instance of this organizational insularity, Donald Arnstine asserts that, "In a bureaucratically organized school, teachers and pupils live in a state of social anomie - of school disintegration and alienation. The number of activities in which people effectively collaborate approaches zero...and the group has little control over its own members."[22] This isolation and fragmentation are much more than social psychology manifestations of disgruntled teachers (workers) who find themselves harnessed to an administrative wagon full of "someone else's" behavioral objectives and petty structures; the real problem must be viewed from a structural frame of reference. "The traditional structure, Boyan states, "assumes a differential in technical expertness between teachers and administrators that justifies merger of the authority of position and the authority of competence at the managerial level."[23] Operationally speaking, this chasm of authority (as a result of the power imbalance) between teachers and administrators leads directly to a diminished stature for teachers and, more importantly, a work-a-day view of teaching coupled with a bureaucratic "mystique" mentality. Noting these developments, Aronowitz points out:

---

21 Israel, p. 115.

22 Arnstine, Donald. "Freedom and Bureaucracy in the Schools." Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling. Vernon F. Haubrich, editor. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (NEA), 1971, p. 17.

23 Boyan, Norman J. "Emergent Role of Teachers and Authority Structure of School." Journal of Secondary Education. Vol. 42, November, 1967, pp. 293-294.

> The struggle of the public school teachers for smaller classes and fewer class hours reflect their recognition that schools are nothing but another factory. The supervision is no less pervasive in teaching than in any other labor, and the teachers' autonomy within the classroom is extremely restricted. The widespread introduction of teaching machines and other audio-visual aids has relegated teachers to the role of consultants in many cases...the old art of instruction has essentially disappeared. Various other innovations have reduced many teachers to little more than equipment operators in the widespread use of standard syllabuses and uniform textbooks, and the recent introduction of programmed instruction into the classroom. Teachers become proctors, dispensing instructions to students on how to use the textbooks or programmed material.[24]

Reducing the "art" of teaching to its basest elements and even further restricting the professional responsibilities of the teacher[25] has effectively neutralized the participatory role of the teacher vis-a-vis the various interrelated processes of planning, decision-making and teaching. Quite aside from establishing a case for occupational misfits, perpetual haranguers and ambitious pyramid climbers, the centrality of the continuing bureaucratic dilemma in the schools may be found in the structure of the organization itself and not in the foibles of individuals.

The seemingly irrepressable bureaucratic propensity toward more "personalized"

---

[24] Aronowitz, Stanley. False Promises: The Shaping of American Working Class Consciousness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973, p. 434.

[25] This has been accomplished, in large part, by the economically and politically motivated "accountability" movement and the profound consequences it has had on the entire range of educational activities. This phenomenon will be discussed in some detail in the last section of this paper.

relationships[26] and less personal autonomy and freedom[27] has certainly enhanced the probabilities that work tasks in most hierarchical institutions will become increasingly fragmented, reified and isolated. An interpretation of the significance of these bureaucratic manifestations on the work roles in the school requires an analytical investigation of the climate of the work environment in the school or, more specifically, the problem of alienation.

---

26 By this we mean that the relationships that exist among co-workers and between the individual worker and the authority structure can be characterized as sets of desultory, de-sensitized employee encounters. Although organizational behavior appears to contain precisely programmed interactions that are deemed essential to the functioning of the organization, there is little opportunity and even less encouragement for human interactions that are based upon the uniqueness of the individuals as well as the commonalities that they share.

27 See Stanley Milgram's Obedience to Authority. New York: Harper and Row, 1974, p. 123-125, 128-30, 138-40; and Richard N. Goodwin's The American Condition. New York: Doubleday, 1974, p. 151-65, 235-36, 245-49 for excellent descriptions of contemporary authoritative repression which is viewed as a protracted phenomenon within Man's existential experience.

"The increase in value of the world of things is directly proportional to the degrease in value of the human world."

-Karl Marx

"An unalienated society is one in which it is no longer the case that the process of production has mastery over man."

-Karl Marx

"Don't change employers, change the employment of life."

-Walls of the Sorbonne, 1968

"All power to the imagination!"

-Walls of the Sorbonne, 1968

III. ALIENATION - THEORY, RESEARCH AND SPECIFIC SOURCES OF ALIENATION IN SCHOOLS

The modern school bureaucracy, in almost all cases, requires teachers, students and administrators to adapt to a work environment which tends to be fragmented, hierarchical, and increasingly technocratic. This statement of position, however, does not include those institutions where groups of administrators, in conjunction with teachers and students, are seriously attempting to come to grips with this problem and are beginning to develop flattened organizations with potentialities for genuine self-management. But such efforts at participatory decision-making and integrated work environment are exceptional cases. For most teachers and students[1], the public schools are not places where power is more or less evenly distributed, where knowledge is integrated into a cohesive and intertwined system of learning, or, to borrow a phrase from Freire, where "critical consciousness" is readily developed. Given this kind of environment, then, we will argue that the public schools are generally alienating workplaces. If this argument is accepted, then it follows that those who work in the schools would be alienated from that work or environment. The problem remains, however, that this argument cannot be accepted out of hand. The idea of alienation, itself, must be examined in more depth before we can explain why and how it is used to explain the general work milieu of schools.

---

[1]Students must be mentioned as sharing in the same general malaise in which teachers are enmeshed. Indeed students have been the subject of relatively numerous alienation studies whereas teachers have been virtually neglected.

Having looked at conceptualizations of the bureaucratic organizational structure of schools as the initial building block in our argument, we will now look at some theories, meanings, and prior research of alienation, especially as it relates to schools. We will also explain why we have adopted that idea of alienation which provided the framework of our argument.

The term "alienation" has increasingly been used to explain a plethora of social problems in modern society and consequently, over the past seven or eight years, there has been an increase in social research that might be classified under the general rubric of studies of alienation. But under this generic heading, there is often a wide diversity of meaning. It is the case that most of the sociological/psychological research done in this area tends to be foundationally similar, yet even here there is a range of conceptual difference. The theoretical underpinnings of the term "alienation" are, however, the main points of disagreement vis-a-vis its employment in the explanation of social conditions or social behavior. The initial premises of the theoretical base are ultimately the most important determinants of the direction taken in research, how the research is actually developed, and what conclusions are made about the findings of such research.[2]

Clearly it is not within the scope of this paper to delve into

---

[2] For a more complete explanation of the sociology of the sociology of social research, we refer the reader to "Recent Trends in Anti-Egalitarian Social Research" by Don Martin and Bob Morgart, AERA Meeting, New Orleans, 1973 (listed in ERIC files).

the historical antecedants of the concept of alienation, its possible roots in Old Testament theology or Plato's view of the natural world and the world of ideas.[3] We think it is sufficient to say that Hegel, Feuerbach and Marx provided the groundwork and elaboration of the idea of alienation and that their interpretations provide the starting point for any present-day analysis or research of alienation. And while we don't wish to expand on the views of Hegel and Feuerbach in this paper, it is important, however, to our analysis that Marx's basic conceptualization of alienation be examimed since it is from this acknowledged base that the crux of our central argument has grown.

Marx began with the Hegelian premise that human development is a process of alienation and dealienation, a dialectic of Becoming, and that alienation can only be overcome (in a dynamic dialectical sense) if it is recognized and adequately known through a process of critical consciousness, both individually and collectively.[4] Arguing that man's alienation could be a continuing process without dealienation, Marx maintained that man in a particular political economy tends to alienate the products of his own activity from himself. His philosophy, research, morals, economic activity, all can become a separate, seemingly independent and powerful world of objects and objectification to which man becomes related as a powerless, dependent object himself.[5] That man can become

---

[3]For a more complete explanation of the roots of the idea of alienation and a meta-historical approach to the sociology of the term, see "Alienation, Education and the Sociology of Knowledge," by Robert Morgart (forthcoming).

[4]Ollman, Bertel. Alienation, 1971, p. 36, 57.

[5]Ibid., p. 142; Schaff, Adam. Marxism and the Human Individual, p. 106-107.

alienated from his intellectual activity by reifying that which he examines and by fragmenting the tools and methods of his research means that one could, by this definition, become alienated from the process of researching alienation. This analysis of what Kolakowski terms the "alienation of reason" is the focal point of our critique of much of the research literature on alienation within particular social settings. If Marx's theory is to serve as a basis for our overall hypothesis of teacher alienation and also for our critique of some of the research done on alienation, then we must look more closely at the development of that theory, before we turn to the more recent definitions and research.

Marx has argued that, given a particular "work environment" or political economy, man becomes alienated from that which he produces. Indeed, the very activity of "production" (i.e., work activity) is alienating, hence man becomes alienated from both the process and product of his labor. Therefore, if, as Marx maintains, man is what he does, then engaging in alienating activity (necessarily with alienating "end-products" of that activity) must produce self-alienation. Or as Richard Bernstein has phrased it:

> ...all alienation can be understood as a form of self-alienation...Alienation results when (man) produces in such a way that his products are at once an expression of his labor-power and at the same time are not a true expression of his potentialities...His products...negate and dehumanize him. In short, to understand Marx, we must grasp the sense in which a product can both be and not be an expression of the producer. It is the producer in the sense that in it is a congealed form of his most distinctive attribute -

---

[6] Ollman, Bertel. Alienation, p. 137, 138, 144.

> activity. But in an alienated society, it is not he in the sense that the product assumes an independent hostile dimension which dehumanizes the producer.[7]

For Marx, an "unalienated society is one in which it is no longer the case that the process of production has mastery over man."[8] A non-alienated man is a man who realizes his historically created human possibilities; one who through praxis and critical consciousness Becomes and enters into the process of fulfilling himself as a free, creative human being.[9]

Still, we have as yet only briefly touched upon parts of the anfractuous webbing of Marx's theory of alienation. The theory, however, can be better developed in use. Which is to say that the efficacy and viability of retaining most of Marx's core concept of alienation can best be shown by using it to analyze a specific issue - in this case, bureaucracy and the everyday work of public school teachers. Nonetheless, a final analytical clarification of Marx might be advisable before we look at modern meanings and research on alienation, and before we focus on the issue itself.[10]

---

7 Bernstein, Richard J., Praxis and Action, p. 44-45.

8 Ibid., p. 47.

9 Ollman, p. 104, 119; Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed, p. 121, 180.

10 Two recent works in which theories of alienation have been developed and which won't be covered here are Alienation by Richard Schacht and The Pursuit of Loneliness by Philip Slater. Although the latter is not meant to be a theoretical piece but rather a very general explanation of what might be termed the crisis of alienation in modern American society. The hermeneutic possibilities are there, however; thus some general theoretical concepts could easily be culled out of Slater's work.

Bernstein, concisely summarizing Marx's idea of alienation, says that:

> ...alienation is clearly...a social category - a category for understanding "political economy," not an ontological category rooted in the nature of man. Alienation is no more and no less fundamental than the reality of the determinate set of political and economic institutions and practices. If these are radically transformed...then alienation can and will be overcome... Secondly, in recent times "alienation" has widely been used to designate some sort of psychological condition in which the individual feels frustrated, unsatisfied, and unfulfilled. However, the psychological dimension of alienation is not primary for Marx, it is secondary and derivitive. One can be in an alienated condition and accept it without full consciousness of man's alienated condition...The issue is not primarily how one - or even a class of people - feel or think of themselves. The issue is rather one of objective conditions and relations under which men labor and produce. Marx is unmoved by the fact that those who have been exploited in a capitalist society may be content with their lot...Thirdly, the technology that has resulted and continues to be developed by capitalism is neither the intrinsic source nor cause of human alienation...he sees in technology the...means for overcoming alienation...Marx's very analysis of alienation and the way in which it must be distinguished from the generic concept of objectification, already begins to point the way to the real historical overcoming of alienation.[11]

By alienation, then, we are not refering to the ontological given of "man's condition," "man alone" posed by the existentialist theories of Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Camus, Beckett, and others. Our approach to alienation will be structural and, secondarily, analytic. That we have done so does not mean that we merely disregard or easily explain away the problem of man's existential "alone-ness." Rather the

---

[11] Bernstein, p. 48-50. Our emphasis wherever seen in this paragraph. For another excellent clarification of Marx's theory, see Richard Goodwin, "The American Condition," Part 2, pp. 54-56. For a comprehensive look at the overall theoretical parameters of alienation, see Joachim Israel's Alienation.

decision was predicated on the need to delimit the problem within semi-workable confines for this particular paper. It could also be argued that Marx's analysis was a more a normative prescription than a structural formulation of the problem of alienation, but again, we will not treat this particular issue, while acknowledging that the point does deserve consideration in a more purely analytic study.

We will now examine some contemporary research on alienation and work. More specifically, we will look at those studies on alienation and the school organizational setting or job satisfaction and work in the public schools. By doing so, we can (a) obtain a sense of the frame(s) of reference and methodologies generally used in modern sociological studies;[12] (b) make some criticisms and recommendations pertaining to the future use of empirical research models; and (c) note what implications the aggregate results of these contemporary research findings have for our argument on bureaucracy and teacher alienation, especially their rele-

---

12 We use the word "sociological" here to indicate again the necessary delimitation on the analysis of alienation. There have been many psychological studies done on alienation and particular individuals, of course, but for our purposes, we will examine only that research which is primarily sociological in nature. This does not mean that we believe the two categorizations can be separated ipso facto and left at that. It is simply a matter of time/space necessity here rather than a belief in separateness of social phenomena which we have argued against consistently. ("Recent Trends in Anti-Egalitarian Social Research," by Don Martin and Bob Morgart, AERA Meeting, New Orleans, 1973 (listed in ERIC files)

vance to the increasing wave of "accountability."[13]

Most of the recent research literature on alienation is based to some degree on the continuing theoretical analyses of Melvin Seeman.[14] Seeman,[15] Neal and Rettig,[16] and Dean,[17] among others, have attempted to delineate the possibilities of empirical measurement of social alienation. Seeman separates alienation into five specific aspects; powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement, and argues against generalizing these specific attitudes (taken separately or in dual combination) into an overall picture of alienation. This conceptualization, along with the particular research methodology leads him to dispute the thesis that alienation from work is the central facet of all alienation.[18]

---

13 Quotation marks indicate our uneasiness with this particular labeling of a new educational gimmick. Orwell said that when the general societal atmosphere began to deteriorate, language tended to be a steady victim. Usually bureaucracies are prime offenders in "newspeak" or "doublethink." The educational bureaucracies are no exception. Since we don't wish to contribute to this kind of linguistic emiseration, we want to distinguish between the so-called form of the word accountability and that many educationists are latching onto, and its given orthodox dictionary meaning. That this particular issue could, itself, be an excellent topic for a paper, gives one some idea of the magnitude of the problem, at least as we see it. Since we have made our point here, we will, for convenience sake, drop the quotation marks in our further discussion of accountability.

14 Lystad, Mary H. "Social Aleination: A Review of Current Literature," 1972.

15 Seeman, Melvin. 1959, 1967, 1971.

16 Neal, Arthur G. and Solomon Rettig. 1967.

17 Dean, Dwight, Jr. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," 1961.

18 Seeman, Melvin. 1959, 1971.

This multidimensional approach is also asserted by Neal and Rettig who suggest the need for a further empirical delineation of the various structures of alienation. They also stress the need to use more mathmatically "elegant" research tools and that complications in understanding alienation arise from the continued adherence to the variants of the Marxist notion of alienation as a class-related ideology.[19] That they believe Marx's concept of alienation to be strictly class-bound and that any reliance on the Marxian model only serves to blur one's analysis, would indicate a very narrow interpretation of Marx on their part. Seeman, on the other hand, does credit Marx for giving us an initial framework for understanding work alienation and points out that he does "recognize both empirical limitations and philosophic difficulties" within the more purely empiricist stance.[20]

From the general definitional studies, we will now turn to those works which deal with alienation as it specifically relates to work and the organizational structure of work. Most researchers begin their studies of alienation and work by measuring or discussing the feelings of powerlessness expressed by workers about their jobs. The degree of lack of control

---

19 Neal and Rettig, 1967, pp. 55, 63. Their discussion of the selection of orthogonality as a rotational criterion in order to fuse structures by means of Ahmavaara's Transformational Analysis to determine structural invariance (which, along with Oblimax, allowed them to extract all factors whose eigenvalue exceeded one) is a gem of obfuscating jargonese.

20 Seeman, 1961, pp. 136, 138.

over the processes and products of work is generally thought to correlate directly with overall feelings of alienation.

Clark (1959) argues that alienation is directly related to the separation of the individual from the major decisions that affect his work and that this is, in part, related to the organizational setting of the job.[21] Robert Blauner (1964) explains that workers[22] experience alienation from their work in the form of powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation and self-estrangement and that such work-related feelings are transferred into other aspects of workers' lives. He suggests the need for genuine individual responsibility for whatever it is one does (i.e., the sense that one's personal decisions are important in the overall scheme of the job one does), and that one must feel that one's individual function in the job setting is truly worth doing.[23] He points out the importance of coherence, cohesiveness and integration in the overall work scheme and that continued job fragmentation and hierarchicalization generally leads to increasing work alienation.[24] But Blauner also says

---

21 Clark, John P. "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System," 1959.

22 When we refer to the word "worker" in this paper, it ought to be taken in its broadest sense, which means it should include all those who must work in order to maintain at least some minimum standard of living and even those who work and maintain an opulent standard of living almost soley as a direct result of their labor. We, therefore, exclude from the category "worker," those people who merely choose to work in order to have something to do, by this, we mean those who could live on stock dividends, securities, property and real estate interests, bank and bond interest returns, etc.

23 Blauner, 1964, pp. 166, 171-73, 182-83.

24 Blauner, pp. 172, 175, 187.

that alienation cannot be generalized from a few settings to all work places, even those of similar hierarchical patterns: that alienation varies from workplace to workplace and that one should not simply declare alienation per se to be a unitary malaise of modern "organization man."[25] To do so, declares Blauner, harms the possibility of discovering the specific roots of particular facets of alienation and therefore prevents the understanding of and possible slowing of specific alienating factors.[26]

Aiken and Hage (1966) using six indices to examine work alienation: (1) Work alienation index, (2) Alienation from expressive relations index, (3) Hierarchy of authority index, (4) Participation in decision-making index, (5) Job Codification index (individual responsibility for job-freedom to make everyday operating decisions about one's job), and (6) Rule observation index, found that lack of participation in organizational decision-making was strongly related to alienation from work. They found a direct relationship between the degree of job codification and alienation from work and a fairly strong relationship between the index of rule observation and both alienation indices.[27] Pearlin (1962) studied conditions which fostered alienation by looking at "subjectively experienced powerlessness within the work organization." He found that

---

[25] Blauner, pp. 173-74; see Kirsch and Lengermann (1972) for the use and support of Blauner's ideas as transposed to white collar settings.

[26] Ibid., pp. 185-187.

[27] Aiken and Hage, 1966; Robinson, Athanasiou, Head, 1969, pp. 200-203.

alienation was most likely to occur where there was considerable hierarchical disparity and where there was little communication or decision-making by those on the lower rungs of the "tall" hierarchy.[28]

Some researchers have warned against universally equating organizational hierarchicalization with work alienation in all cases, and argue for further theoretical groundwork before being too enthusiastic about the macro-application of reported empirical relationships. Jon Shepard (1972) argues, for example, that alienation can only be understood as a syndrome of related factors and not as a unitary concept, even though the probabilities are very high that tall hierarchy= powerlessness=alienation. Shepard's work leads him to believe that the three independent variables of powerlessness, meaninglessness and normlessness may or may not be necessary factors for alienation and that they are likely not to be sufficient factors.[29]

Bonjean and Grimes (1970, 1971) also attest to the multidimensionality of the relationship between bureaucracy and alienation. They argue that "there has been a tendency in the literature to suggest a direct relationship between bureaucratization and alienation without specifying the bureaucratic characteristics related to different forms or dimensions of alienation."[30] In their research design, Bonjean and Grimes

---

28 Robinson, Athanasiou and Head, 1969), pp. 204-205. For an excellent summation of most of the literature relating to work alienation, job satisfaction, and motivation, see Patchen, Tausky, Robinson, et al in Robinson, Athanasiou and Head.

29 Shepard, 1972, pp. 162-63, 170-71.

30 Bonjean and Grimes, 1970, p. 365.

used five characteristics of bureaucracy: (1) hierarchy of authority, (2) specialization, (3) impersonality, (4) system of rules, (5) procedures; and six measures of alienation: (1) powerlessness, (2) normlessness, (3) social isolation, (4) general alienation, (5) anomia, (6) self-estrangement, in order to determine whether some dimensions of bureaucracy are more closely related to alienation than others.[31] They found, as did Seeman (1967), that the data did not support the overall generalization of bureaucratization=alienation; that is, from their research one cannot infer a necessary correlation between bureaucratization and alienation. But they do add that, "This is not to deny a relationship between some dimensions of bureaucracy and some types of alienation at certain societal levels, but it does suggest that qualification and specification are in order."[32]

In a critique of the Bonjean-Grimes approach, Barry Anderson (1971) (who we believe has done the best empirical work to date on the relationship between bureaucracy and student alienation in the schools) suggests some alternative methods in the study of bureaucracy and alienation. He finds that the problems in the Bonjean-Grimes approach hinge on four basic issues: (1) unit of analysis, (2) instrumentation, (3) dimensionality of bureaucracy and alienation, and (4) data analysis.[33] He argues, accurately we think, that Bonjean and Grimes, although doing

---

31 Ibid., p. 367.

32 Ibid., p. 371.

33 Anderson, 1971, p. 614.

a study of the consequences of organizational characteristics, ultimately use the individual as their unit of analysis. In research which uses perceptual measures of bureaucracy, says Anderson, such analysis is not sound since "variance attributable to individuals ought to be ignored (and that) some organizational unit and some form of consensus among people is a logical prerequisite for (such) a study."[34] We also agree with Anderson's point that the problem of unit of analysis in Bonjean-Grimes probably means that their conclusion suggesting no direct general relationship between bureaucratization and alienation is likely to be erroneous.[35]

Anderson also takes Bonjean and Grimes to task for their reliance on existing instruments for their conceptualization and measurement:

> Acceptance of existing scales without critical analysis of their content and purposes in relation to the objectives of the study can be a primary source of spurious...findings.[36]

Indeed, as we have examined many of the scale items used in the Bonjean-Grimes study, it often seemed that such items would be better suited to the ferretting out of manic-depressives than they would be for linking bureaucracy and alienation. Or as Anderson states, "...it is hardly surprising that there are few significant associations between bureaucratization and anomia (for example). The ordinary organization can hardly be thought to drive a man to despair about the world, although it might

---

34 Ibid., p. 615.

35 Ibid.

36 Ibid.

well drive him to despair about his job.[37]

Finally, two studies concerned with the connection between bureaucracy and alienation for professionals offer us some further insights into the problem of work alienation and organizational structure. Miller (1967) agrees with both the earlier Blau-Scott thesis that bureaucracy and professionalism rest upon fundamentally conflicting principles, and with Kronhouser's work which suggests that professionals need considerable job autonomy if they are to fulfill their professional needs.[38] Miller states that the work of professionals ought to be characterized by high intrinsic satisfaction, positive involvement and commitment to professional standards. But he also cautions that one ought not to make an easy connection between job dissatisfaction and self-estrangement or job dissatisfaction and overall alienation, even in research on professionals and bureaucracy. Miller agrees with Marx, and in a circuitous way, Seeman, when he points out that a person may be alienated from his work and yet still be satisfied with his job, or possibly be dissatisfied with his job and not alienated from his work.[39] He concludes by indicating that the alienation manifested by the professionals he studied probably resulted from their lack of power and participation in the work organization and from the lack

---

37 Anderson, p. 616; Anderson's critique is such a superb example of sound empirical criticism that it is well worth reading in its entirety, especially since we can't enumerate all the excellent points made therein. For a reply to Anderson's critique, see Bonjean-Grimes, 1971.

38 Miller, 1967, p. 755.

39 Ibid., p. 759.

of autonomy on their specific jobs.[40]

In a composite sketch of other studies on professionalism and bureaucracy, Williams (1971) also argues that professionalism and bureaucracy are in "natural conflict." Using the schools as an example of a work organization where this is likely to occur, he states that the more teachers attempt to truly fulfill their professional roles, the greater the likelihood that they will come into conflict with the general bureaucratic structure that characterized most schools.[41] After enumerating some typologies of professionalism and bureaucracy, he indicates that "the person who has not fully mastered a body of knowledge (mastering a body of knowledge being a characteristic of professionalism), would function with greater ease in the bureaucratic organization than the true professional," and that the bureaucracy tends to "severely limit the professional who must constantly choose from a variety of alternatives in the application of knowledge" since it demands predictability in decisions and learning.[42] Williams further adds that "If a teacher is limited by bureaucratic rules in the way he applies his knowledge, then the logical result is that the service rendered the student may not be the maximum that coudd be provided by the particular teacher."[43] And

---

40 Miller, p. 767.

41 Williams, pp. 61-62.

42 Williams, p. 65; For further reading about the problems of professionalism, bureaucracy and administration, see the excellent collection of articles edited by Walter Hack, et al, Educational Administration: Selected Readings (Allyn and Bacon, 1971) and the penetrating and concise work by Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in the Schools (Prentice-Hall, 1970).

43 Ibid.

while Williams dosen't discuss any research implications in the study of bureaucracy and alienation, or even the connecting factors or correlations per se, he does discuss what he feels to be the implications of the research he has surveyed. Like Miller, and most of the other researchers we have looked at up to this point, Williams argues (albeit in a more overt fashion) for maximum feasible job autonomy and for much more overall decision-making participation and power for the professional workers in the schools;[44] "knowledge workers" to use Peter Drucker's phrase.[45]

Before we look at some of the specific research on alienation, job satisfaction/dissatisfaction, and organizational structure (especially bureaucracy) in the schools, however, we should begin to think about what implications all the above research might have for teachers in an even more highly regimented and "rationalized" bureaucracy which would seem to be the probable result of a massive scale accountability movement within the particular objective historical circumstances of 1974 America.

---

44 Ibid., p. 67.

45 See our discussion, later in this paper, of Drucker's ideas on "Teacher as Knowledge-worker" and his thesis that schools must follow business management precepts and become "accountable" by performance to set objectives. Peter Drucker, Management, Harper and Row, 1974.

By briefly examining research specifically focusing on schools as the place of work organization, we want to further emphasize the connection between work alienation and a hierarchical bureaucratic structure - and conversely, the correlation that generally seems to be the case between a "flattened," "open" democratic form of organization and overall work satisfaction.[46]

Belasco and Alutto (1972) used eight indices to measure the correlation between decisional participation and teacher satisfaction: (1) satisfaction, (2) decisional participation, (3) trust, (4) job tension, (5) authoritarianism, (6) role conflict, (7) perceptions of administrative influence, and (8) attitudinal militancy. They suggest that there is a significant positive relationship between teacher satisfaction and amount of decisional participation.[47] Coughlan's studies of "open" and "closed" school systems (1970, 1971) indicate that professional responsibility, internal communication, and general job satisfaction are considerably enhanced in an "open" school organizational setting.[48] And Carpenter (1971), Chung (1970), and Gerhardt and Miskel (1972) tell us that tall bureaucracy

---

[46] Admittedly, this presents some theoretical problems, since, as we mentioned before, one cannot say that alienation from work necessarily equals job dissatisfaction nor that job satisfaction immediately negates overall work alienation. Partly, this seeming paradox is a problem of definition. That is, what is the point of origin from which one begins to study the problem; in this case, alienation. It is also, however, a problem of diagnosis; the "how" or methodological and the general frame of reference of the analysis. This, of course, calls for an analysis of the analyses - a much needed study that will only briefly be touched on in this paper.

[47] Belasco and Alutto (1972), pp. 47-50.

[48] By "open" system, Coughlan means one in which there is considerable job autonomy and upward influence, which we interpret to mean decisional participation by teachers. Coughlan (1970) pp. 26, 28, 32-33; (1971) pp. 50-51, 56-57.

generally means that teachers will have lower job satisfaction and feelings of lack of professional growth, whereas teachers in flattened organizational structures tend to feel a greater professional responsibility for what they do and have higher feelings of job satisfaction.[49] Chung says that high job satisfaction of teachers correlates with participatory decision-making, increased teacher autonomy, much interpersonal communication and easily accessible relationships between every area of the organization. He concludes that a school organization which maximizes the variables is very likely to provide a structure for optimizing teaching/learning effectiveness.[50] Gerhardt and Miskel add that a flattened organization wherein the administrative staff act as coordinators or service specialists rather than directors can greatly alleviate teacher role conflict.[51]

In four studies which specifically examine the relationship between bureaucracy and alienation in the schools (rather than bureaucracy and job satisfaction as in the above mentioned papers) the findings are somewhat more complex and are less easily integrated into our own hypothesis; the moreso because three of the articles focus on student alienation, rather than on teachers and alienating work roles. Barry Anderson (1971, 1972) in two excellent research pieces which are at once concise and inclusive, argues that Seeman's dimensional model of alienation seems to hold for his work on students and bureaucracy.

---

49 Carpenter (1971), pp. 463-64.

50 Chung (1970), pp. 19-20.

51 Gerhardt and Miskel (1972), p. 10.

That is, if we are to gain any kind of significant information in this area, Anderson is saying that we will have to "tie specific aspects of bureaucratic structure (e.g., rules and regulations) to specific aspects of alienation (e.g., powerlessness)."[52] He does suggest in his prior study, however, that high bureaucratization of schools seems to be a more typical organizational arrangement for students from lower SES backgrounds than for those from higher SES levels; and that this just might have something to do with the achievement deficiencies of such students.[53] If we make a few small inferential leaps here, we might opine that this high bureaucratization level leads to lack of autonomy and participation in decision-making for teachers which, in turn, leads to a decrease in professional responsibility by teachers and lessened job satisfaction for them. This could regress to a state of lowered teaching effectiveness, which would necessarily lead to lower student achievement, which could account for increasing indications of alienation in relation to other specific variables - which brings us back to Anderson. Admittedly, the above progression is built on very tenuous logical supports, but it does seem to us well worth pursuing. Using Anderson's work as a guiding empirical starting point, further research ought to begin looking, in as many ways as possible, using as great a variety of research tools as is feasible (methodologies from Seeman to Sennett to Cobb), at

---

[52] Anderson (1973), pp. 330-331. Anderson used five indices of alienation in this study: (1) powerlessness, (2) meaninglessness, (3) misfeasance (feelings of necessity to cheat), (4) futility, and (5) self-estrangement; and six dimensions of bureaucracy: (1) specialization, (2) procedural specification, (3) hierarchy of authority, (4) rules, (5) technical competence, and (6) impersonality. pp. 319-20.

[53] Anderson (1971), pp. 13, 18.

specific aspects of alienation and to determine with which aspects of bureaucracy they tend to correlate. Before any data collection begins, however, the research design, methodology and theoretical foundation of such a study ought to be closely scrutinized in a "sociology of knowledge" perspective. A rigorous analytic examination must be applied in order to check whether or not such research has moved beyond the confines of sheer stated assumption. Having done all this, the researcher could then proceed with the business of finding out whether such correlations as were mentioned above would hold to any significant degree.

Two other studies on school bureaucratization and alienation also confirm the need for further research efforts in this area. Rafalides and Hoy (1971) and Meyers (1972) both agree with Anderson's thesis about the multi-dimensionality of alienation and bureaucracy and state that more research is needed to explore the correlations between specific dimensions of the two conceptualizations.[54] Unfortunately, in both these particular studies, there tends to be a greater reification within the research methodologies used than is the case in more finely-honed empirical studies (e.g., Anderson). Indeed, their research designs insure that the bureaucracy indices won't significantly correlate with the particular alienation variables used. That is, the findings of their research were predictable, from just a cursory examination of their initial premises and design. It is tempting to say that this is the kind of "much ado about nothing" that is to be expected from the more strictly positivistic kinds of research. But

---

54 Rafalides and Hoy (1971), p. 110; Meyers (1972, p. 17, 19.

this would be to explain away some very serious analytic questions about researching alienation much too glibly.[55]

We do suggest, however, that it is possible that too many people have taken the problem of teacher bureaucracy and work alienation too lightly, and that this factor in itself, would have serious carry-over to most empirical research efforts (even in the most meticulously thought-out works such as Anderson and Seeman). This, alone could cause researchers to seriously misread teacher/worker priorities, and indeed, engender an "inauthentic" response vis-a-vis the teacher's perceptions about their work.[56] In other words, certain indicators of alienation, initially established by the researchers, that don't appear to be at all significant in the final data analysis, might become glaringly evident if just one or two of the initial premises were changed or if some of the specifics in the design were altered such as questions in the attitudinal survey or method of presenting the questions. That this is the case can be easily seen by looking at the results of work alienation surveys from the 1950's and from the 1970's. In some of the most recent surveys, questions are worded and presented in a much less direct and threatening form than is evident on prior attitudinal research. And, given a changing (different) society with changing priorities toward work (in many cases), some of the initial premises of such research have also changed.

---

55 This problem will be treated at length in "Alienation, Education and the Sociology of Knowledge," by Robert Morgart (forthcoming).

56 See Martin and Morgart, "Recent Trends in Anti-Egalitarian Social Research" AERA Meeting, New Orleans, 1973 (listed in ERIC files).

This brings us to another problem that becomes more and more evident as one examines the mass of empirical research on the subject of alienation - that is, the matter of dichotomy and polychotomy of perception;[57] the anfractuous nexus of intersubjectivity between investigator and investigatee. Certainly the denial of the coterminous nature of the investigator and investigated, as well as the attempt to analyze the whole by the sum of its parts and then searching out correlations between the parts of a social whole is partly doomed to failure, insofar as one does not take into account interactions between observer and observed, and recognize that the whole of any social phenomenon is (1) greater than, and (2) different from, the sum of its parts. Any empirical research that is to move beyond mere mathematical design/methodological elaboration, then, must take into account all that ideological baggage which we necessarily carry with us as members of any society or culture at any given time. As we have suggested elsewhere, what we need is a set of questions that address assumptions that we tend to forget (or never knew) we were operating on.[58]

Edward Shaffer (1970) in an excellent theoretical outline on alienation and education, suggests that, "By beginning from a set of "objective" constructs without examining the very world which makes inquiry possible, the individual

---

57 See the works of R. D. Laing for an in depth look at the ramifications of this problem; for example Interpersonal Perception (with Phillipson and Lee), Springer Publications, and The Politics of Experience, Ballantine.

58 For a much more complete elaboration of the problem of research which we have outlined here, see Martin and Morgart "Recent Trends in Anti-Egalitarian Social Research" AERA Meeting, New Orleans, 1973 (listed in ERIC files).

remains an outsider and therefore alienated from the "meaning" of social reality itself."[59] Arguing for more conceptual work in this area, he states that, "The social distribution of knowledge that is taken for granted and used to interpret different aspects of social reality is the proper subject for inquiry of a phenomenologically oriented sociology of education. It is one of the scandals of traditional modes of education that the general thesis of the natural attitude has been ignored."[59] Indeed; we would assert that the study of the social construction of this knowledge/research on alienation and work is also a proper area of study for a sociology which is built partly on the holistic Marxian foundation.[60] Clearly, researchers must be careful that they don't fall victim to the ever-present Siren of an a-historical, a-cultural empiricism.

With an increasing sophistication in methodology and research design and with a greater emphasis on coming to grips with theoretical questions such as these mentioned above, however, we can hopefully anticipate the growth of a multi-disciplinary understanding of work alienation and its consequences and determinants (and for our purposes, especially as it relates to teachers).[61] Without varied and

---

[59] Shaffer, p. 128.

[60] Leszek Kolakowski, the brilliant neo-Marxist philosopher, has suggested that positivist research itself is an alienating activity - "the alienation of reason."

[61] Though we had planned to do our own survey research of work alienation and teachers in different bureaucratic settings, we began to realize that what needed to be done more than further research was a critique of the existing research - a critique which would encompass an analytic, phenomenological, and a Marxian (Frankfurt critical theory variety) examination of the theoretical underpinnings of the previous research. We would also argue that there is a need for less reliance on the crutch of statistics in such research. That is, we can often learn more from one Sennett and Cobb-type of study than from ten randomly selected ASR articles combined. Indeed, we believe that learning and understanding people's deepest feelings about themselves and their everyday working lives - in dialogical manner - is a significant part of the research we ought to be about if we are looking for correlations between work alienation and hierarchical organizational structure.

continuous testing of this understanding in real work situations and without involved discussions of a one to one relationship (dialogue) between the researcher and individual workers who are being researched, however, these studies will be at best only partially descriptive surveys with little in the way of recommendations except "more research."[62]

It is clear that work alienation, especially as it may be a growing phenomenon for the modern public school teacher, is a complex and as yet relatively unalalyzed motif in social/administrative science of education. To paraphrase Paul Kimmel, the study of work alienation is really only at the threshold of scientific inquiry.[63]

The task. then, is to develop the methods and tools of a non-reifying social research based on the precepts of critical theory, yet which can also produce quantifiable results; a research which is at once empirical and dynamic.

All the research, critiques of research, and suggestions for further research notwithstanding, however, we are still left with the task of elaborating on our overall thesis of the likelihood of increasing teacher work alienation in the Seventies. We suggested that this problem would, in the main, stem from a probable continuance of - or increase of - the hierarchical organizational bureaucracies. And we pointed out that this kind of hierarchicalization, typified

---

62 Robinson, Athanasiou, Head, 1969, p. 22.

63 See Paul Kimmel's concise and important essay in Robinson, Athanasiou and Head, "Research on Work and the Worker in the United States," pp. 17-22. For some the more recent studies on the meaning of work and work alienation, see Gooding (1968); Best (1973); Parker (1971); Garson (1972, 1973, 1974); Herzberg (1965); Gintis (1972, 1973); Vroom (1969, 1970); and Jenkins, et al (1973). See Bibliography for further reference.

in the burgeoning accountability movement (and congruent with the purported "teacher surplus" issue), probably results in increased job dissatisfaction among teachers, decreased professional commitment, and the estrangement of intellectual pursuits and critical consciousness in learning.[64] If genuine intellectual growth and the development of dynamic cognitive learning abilities in students is the stated basis for the accountability movement and the increased hierarchicalization that is likely to accompany it, then we will argue that, even assuming good faith on the part of all its proponents (an assumption that may be glaringly naive, as we will point out in the following section of this paper), such a move will fail, given the overall ramifications of work satisfaction mentioned above.

---

64 Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Herder and Herder, 1970.

...the prosaic man (accountabilist) is forever incapable of considering issues in depth. He stays at the surface; he remains with things that permit readily specifiable action. He entertains no questions with respect to life, man, or society that do not obviously lead to specific things to do. Everything else, it seems to him, is mere words - idealistic, not realistic; sentimental, not practical. Confronted with a difficulty, the prosaic man gets busy; he works at one thing and works at another; he changes, modifies, and manipulates; he institutes projects and programs;...holds meetings, collects data...develops techniques. And he does all this without ever asking a single fundamental question, without ever attending to such basic things as the aims, underlying assumptions, values, or justification of what he is dealing with and what he is doing. Therefore, all his busyness - restless, nerve-racking, and exhausting - is at bottom only tinkering with and an accelerating of what already exists.

- George W. Morgan

IV. FEAR AND LOATHING FOR THE ACCOUNTABILITY "MOVEMENT": A JOURNEY INTO THE BUREAUCRATIC WASTELAND.

The tall bureaucratic structure that has dominated public school administrators has all but excluded public school teachers from the important educational concerns of professional, curricular, and fiscal policy decision-making. As we have argued, even with the current growth of union strength, teachers generally have not gained meaningful control over the processes of their work and an increasing degree of teacher alienation has generally coincided with the increasing hegemony of a hierarchical bureaucracy.

Two recent developments are rapidly taking shape which present perhaps the greatest threat to date for eroding newly acquired teacher power and the potential for preventing teachers from gaining equal control over educational policy decisions affecting their work. First, a well publicized, but yet to be substantiated, nationwide critical teacher "surplus";[1] and, second, what has become popularly known as the "accountability movement." Teacher surplus approximated the rise of the accountability movement, and even though there are considerable quantitative data explaining teacher surplus,[2] qualitatively, these data leave much

---

[1]While many administrators and economists speak of a great teacher surplus, it is clear to us by looking at school classrooms that rather than too many there are too few teachers. There is a surplus only in so far as we refuse to pay for more teachers and that could be financed from the trimming of a grotesque military budget. For further discussion of this "issue" see: Teacher Shortage or Surplus: That is the Question. National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, Washington, D. C. June 1972 and The Supply and Demand of Teacher and Teaching, Leo J. Shapiro and Evelyn Zerfos, housed at the University of Nebraska Curriculum Center Lincoln ,Nebraska.

[2]For an analysis of the prospects of a teacher surplus for the next few years see: Trends in Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools 1973-1976, William S. Graybeal, NEA Research Division, Washington,D.C. 1973.

to be desired. Speculation about the effects surplus can have upon teachers is more hazardous than theorizing about the accountability movement.

Accordingly, the remainder of this paper will focus on the effects accountability can have upon American public school teachers and especially the possible resultant barriers to teacher's acquiring an equal share of control over educational decision making in all sectors-and thus contributing, as we have shown,to the likelihood of increasing teacher alienation from their work situation. The direction of our emphasis is not intended, however, to mean that teacher surplus is any less threatening to teacher autonomy than is accountability. The fact that teacher surplus and accountability emerged at about the same time as an increasé in teacher power is not, we believe, merely an historical accident. This is a complex issue and only much more research and reflection on the covergence of these three important historical developments can provide an accurate analysis.

When more research has been completed, however, we suspect that accountability will be seen partly as a labor market stabilizer much in the same vein and purpose of I.Q. and achievement tests.[3] Accountability will be the means of selecting out and firing teachers which will serve a three fold purpose for astute administrators but especially for the corporate system as a whole. On the one hand it will serve to assuage the angry inner-city parents who feel that their children are getting inferior schooling by making them believe something significant is being done for "equal opportunity." At the same time, it will reinforce the image of the teacher as the problem and thus by scapegoating teachers, it will continue

---

[3]See: Lazerson, Karier, et. al. for a discussion of the needs and roots of testing Marvin Lazerson, "Educational Testing, and Social Policy" Harvard Review Reprint No. 23; Clarence Karier, "Testing for Order and Control in the Corporate Liberal State" in Roots of Crisis, Karier, Violas and Spring, Rand Mc Nally, 1973, pp. 108-137

to divert attention from the real sources of the problem of inequality in this society. Finally, it will be a stabilizing barrier to effective class consciousness by teachers, since, like the I. Q. Tests "working class child syndrome" accountability will claim objectivity, fairness and universality of standards. Thus, in this fashion accountability and its technocratic accomplishments might quell the growing power of teacher unionism and further constrain schools from truly becoming sources of individual self-discovery and a collective power outgrowth by both students and teachers. We think accountability is the best contrivance thus far for "neutralizing" the power of real education and for "mickey-mousing" teachers to distraction and ultimate capitulation to the innocuous problem of positivistic learning.

Those teachers first encountering accountability terminology were surely bewildered by the complexity of a bureaucratic language that was used to explain the myriad of educational benefits. Claims by proponents of this movement vary widely as to what can be achieved - from what amounts to a basic 3 r's curriculum to a humanistic one or from the claim of centralized to decentralized control of the schools. It seems as though the language is created first, and theory and practice are subsequently considered and then rationalized. Nevertheless, teachers are confronted with the deadening task of learning a new lexicon of terminology and symbols. Management by objectives, systems analysis, in-puts, out-puts, quality control, educational engineering, vouchers, generic and enabling objectives, activities and competencies, omnicompetencies, modules, CBTE, PBTE, are the more salient linguistic drugery that the neophite to accountability faces.

It is not that slogans are unique to today's teachers, for they have had a long history of spurious influence in our schools, but educational slogans seem

to have an added and special significance for the present accountability movement. As Israel Scheffler posits, educational slogans "make no claim to facilitating communication or reflecting meaning" but are

> repeated warmly and reassuringly, rather than pondered gravely .... They provide rallying symbols of the key ideas and attitudes of an educational movement. They both express and foster community of spirit, attracting new adherents and providing reassurance and strength to veterans .... With the passage of time, however, slogans are often increasingly interpreted... as literal doctrines or argument, rather than merely as rallying symbols. When this happens in a given case, it becomes important to evaluate the slogan both as a straight forward assertion and as a symbol of a practical social movement.[4]

A linguistic analysis of the slogans used in the accountability movement is, of course, beyond the scope of this paper but it does seem necessary to note the important and sometimes critical, place they play in the movement and their ideological implications. Over and over again one reads and hears "business/management/efficiency" and "science of education" language. In even a cursory examination of the movement, the economic implications and purposes become obvious in the very nature and the structure of accountability language.[5]

The search for a broad theoretical rational for accountability can be found in the behavioristic/mechanistic theories of B. F. Skinner, but more "prac-

---

[4]The Language of Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1960, pp. 36-37.

[5]For an extended discussion of the relationship of slogans to accountability see: "Performance-based Teacher Education: Examination of a Slogan." Margaret Linsey, The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall 1973, pp. 180-186.

tical" theories were located in the initial writings of the high priest of the movement, Leon Lessinger. In his pioneering work, Every Kid A Winner: Accountability in Education.[6] Lessinger compared the American educational system to a malfunctioning machine and emphasized the necessity of preparing "educational engineers" to correct that malfunction. His industrial model of the teacher as an educational engineer called for a "workable technology of instruction" and "certain managerial procedures that both stimulate the demand for performance and help to provide it."[7] The educational engineer provides "tables and text" on how much it will cost the community for performance contracting. Continuing, Lessinger declared that

> A major objective of educational engineering is to arm educational practitioners with both the technological competence of essential engineering generalizations, strategies, and tools and the professional practice of a successful instructor or educational manager.[8]

Lessinger and a number of other accountability spokesmen seem intent upon equating the functions and purposes of schools to business and industry and they seem obsessed with the economics of schooling. Speaking from an organizational, managerial, and technological point of view, Lessinger compared formal

---

[6]Published by Science Research Associates in concert with Simon, Schuster, Inc., New York, 1970.

[7]Ibid. 32

[8]Ibid.

education to a "cottage industry."

> Costs accelerate, yet there is little improvement in productivity. *The "industry" is labor intensive*- over 85 percent of the average budget is spent for salaries and for benefits related to salaries. Such a share of the educational dollar, coupled with teacher militancy, collective bargaining and tenure, presents such community problems of runaway costs divorced from responsive improvement.[9]

Lessinger's warnings about the growing threat of teacher union power to school budgets could only have struck a responsive note to cost conscious school administrators,parents, and politicans to rally around the cause of accountability. Yet Götz (1974) is correct in saying that "with characteristic duplicity we continue to proclaim marvelous humanistic objectives while judging the success of our schools in purely economic terms."[10]

One of the most blatant and, to us, frightening advocacy of cost-cutting in the schools appeared in the recent March issue of the Kappan in James G. Abert's[11] unequivocal recommendations to schools for reducing the cost of education. Abert maintains that the financial problems facing the schools should cause educators to "look at education as an industry and [they should] start to speak of the effects of shifting such ratios as capital to labor and out-put to labor,"[12] [that is, schools must shift from being intensive industries to

---

[9] Ibid 74.

[10] Götz, 1974, p. 91

[11] Presently director of research, National Center for Resource Recovery and formely, deputy assistant for evaluation and program monitoring at HEW,

[12] "Wanted: Experiments in Reducing the Cost of Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV. No.7 March 1974, pp. 444.

capital intensive industries]. Education is considered as an enterprise whose employees compete for a share of the national product ... with employees in all areas of the economic activity. To prevent teacher wage deterioration relative to industrial employees, Abert suggests two possible remedies to school officials.

> The first is to follow the lead of manufacturing industries .... by substituting capital for labor [automation,] thus increasing the capital-to-labor ratio [educational hardware, cheaper than teachers]. The second is to vary the labor mix systematically such that while the range of wages, high to low, may not change, larger numbers of employees are at the low end, thereby holding the average wage down.[13]

Noting what he considered a rapid increase in wages for elementary and secondary schools, Abert then emphasized that

> It is important ... not to lose sight of the fact that there must be fewer hands [teachers]. .... The labor force mix strategy requires .... 'cheaper' people to be mixed with the trained professional cadre. There are[three] obvious groups who can and do provide services at less than the prices demanded by regular employees [teachers] .... students ... retirees .... and volunteer or semivolunteer housewives .... It would seem obvious that large shifts to student instruction -- call it supervised peer groups or peer group 'plus-a-couple-of-years'-- might pay handsome dividends. The same is true of using large numbers of retiree paraprofessionals in the classroom.[14]

---

[13] Ibid. What this would do, at least for a while, would be to throw teachers into the "secondary" labor market. See: Piore, Edwards et al;

[14] Ibid. 445.

An analysis of Abert's "experimental" proposals leads us to conclude that such proposals are already, in fact, being carried out in nearly all school districts: the cutting of services and staff and the hiring practice of employing the beginning teacher, paraprofessionals, and permanent substitutes, who are less experienced but much cheaper than the experienced teacher. Too, all types of educational hardware are utilized, and there is independent and group study, programmed instructional materials, team teaching, peer-group - instructional assistance, and many other teaching/learning cost-cutting techniques. Written materials favoring accountability are ladden with promises of economic efficiencies for school systems that implement competency or performance based educational programs in their schools. The ideas flowing from such literature not only buttress present cost accounting practices in the schools but provide the theoretical basis for the future proliferation of these practices and for many yet-to-be developed ones that are on accountability drawing-boards.

Teachers cannot help but become the most victimized party in such economic considerations. Their increased economic vulnerability can only lead to a worsening alienated condition. They become, as noted in our prior terminology, alienated from the process of their work since as professionals they sell their labor for use in a mechanistic system in which they have little real power or autonomy. And by extending this analogy between the schools and the economic behavioral basis of the modern firm, we see the student becoming even more blatantly the merchandisable product. It is not difficult to see that accountability contributes to the development of individual identies as market commodities.

Even those educational strategies in the accountability mold which allegedly concentrate on each individual student are, in reality, marketing pro-

cedures which manipulate the student into developing harmony with both macro and micro organizational demands. Thus while the controls will be of a "soft" scientific nature, they will be no less in control for both students and teachers. As we have said, more boundaries and more complexities are being added to the already ponderous bureaucratic system which will make change all the more difficult to contemplate, let alone effect.

The most sophisticated economic justification for accountability, we believe, comes not from the pen of an educationist but from the writings of Peter Drucker, the highly regarded dean of American management science. From his recent work Management[15], Drucker declares that it is mandatory for service institutions, like schools, to stop being such parasites on the well-being of the market economy; that is, all service institutions, such as schools, are paid for out of economic surplus and therefore, they are social overhead. But it is not just the increasing cost of service institutions [schools] that makes it mandatory for them to be managed.[16] Schools are mismanaged and are justifiably attacked for lack of performance![17] In fact, schools must look to business to learn management by objectives - at present, they simply are not managed.[18] We must, says Drucker, make school work productive and the workers [teachers] achieve.[19] Managing schools for performance - holding them accountable - is our greatest

---

[15]New York, Harper Row, 1974.

[16]Ibid. 132. Our emphasis.

[17]Ibid. 133.

[18]Ibid 134.

[19]Ibid. 135. Our emphasis.

managerial need today.[20] Schools need not differ from the firm, and indeed really are not different except for terminology - differences are in technology not substance.[21]

For Drucker, the major difference between schools and business is that schools must be based on effectiveness not efficiency.[22] Effectiveness - that is to say student achievement - can be measured easily and precisely by the use of behavioral objectives. Indeed, achievement is never possible except if it is measured against specific, limited, clearly defined tragets.[23] Performance must no longer be the ability to increase one's budget as has too long been the case with schools. Schools have for too long substituted public relation for performance.[24] Drucker defines teachers as "knowledge workers"[25] and since they are workers they must be managed like any other workers. But what really matters is for schools to be accountable and to truly focus on results.[26]

To summerize, Drucker believes the schools need the following:

1) clear objectives and goals
2) priorities of concentration
3) measurements of performance

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid. 136. Our emphasis.

[22] Ibid. 138. Our emphasis.

[23] Ibid. 140.

[24] Ibid. 143.

[25] Ibid. 176. Our emphasis.

[26] Ibid. 155.

4) feedback and to build in self control from results

5) organized audit of objectives and results

6) to identify unsatisfactory performance and activities that are obsolete unproductive or both

7) to abandon "low-performance" activities

8) competition between schools to hold them to performance standards.[27]

And for those who may not see any seriousness of purpose or urgency in Drucker's pro-accountability message, he declares to them that "we cannot tolerate the present system much longer - we must hold schools to rigorous performance standards."[28]

In addition to examining the critical interrelationship between educational accountability and the economics of the Corporate State. It also seems necessary and logical to extend that examination to the polity. National politicans have spoken in support of educational accountability. Congressman Roman Pucinski of Chicago ,for example, referred to educational engineering as a coming revolution in America . More importantly, however, is the fact that a majority of the state legislatures have mandated competency based teacher education programs and that performance contracts between government and private corporations are proliferating - HEW with the Rand Corporation and the OEO's $5,6 million investment in 18 school districts, to name a few.

---

[27] Ibid. 160-163 Our emphasis.

[28] Ibid. 165.

Teacher unions have also become involved in the politics of accountability under the title of "accountability," the preamble to the contract between the New York City Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers for the period September, 1969 to September, 1972 pledged that the union and the board would "develop objective criteria of accountability."[29] This was in part, an outgrowth of the political struggles over community control in some New York City schools in the late 1960's, especially Oceanhill-Brownsville. UFT President, Albert Shanker, has asserted that an accountability system would give teachers the greatest protection ever known by guarding competent teachers from unwarrented criticism and providing assistance to less capable teachers.[30] But Shanker saw accountability differently than parents. Parents (mainly black) wanted teacher accountability to ensure a better education for their children, whereas Shanker, although desirous of quality education, gave priority to better teacher protection. This placed Shanker's position on accountability outside the sphere of pedegogic matters and into the arena of the politics of teacher power (vis-a-vis black parents) and especially into a concern with the possible erosion of teacher power resulting from accountability schemes. The political struggle between black parents and Shanker (and the UFT) resulted, in part, from varying interpretations of "accountability."

Support for accountability came even from the very highest political office in the land. As early as 1970 Nixon, in a special message to Congress on

---

[29]Accountability: The Hazard of Blame-Placing," Albert Shanker's, (Where We Stand) New York Times, January 7, 1973.

[30]"Accountability and Progress by Nomenclature, Old Ideas in New Bottles." Jacob Landers, Phi Delta Kappan Vol. LIV No. 8, April, 1973, 539.

educational reform, stated his backing for the movement. Attacking the high cost and "failure" of federal compensatory education programs, he compared federal money spent to the poor results in achievement.

> From these considerations we derive another new concept: accountability. School administrators and school teachers alike are responsible for their performances and it is in their interest as well as in the interests of their pupils that they be held responsible .... we have, as a nation, too long avoided thinking of the productivity of the schools.[31]

In this same message Nixon called for the establishment of the National Institute of Education which was soon to be given a leading role in spearheading many accountability schemes.

When James E. Allen resigned as United States Commissioner of Education (his opposition to the Vietnam War did not endear him to the President), Sidney P. Marland Jr. assumed his position, and it was not long before Marland began championing the cause of accountability. He said "I laud such elements of accountability as are present in performance contracting and the independent audit of performance" and viewed "management by objectives ... as an important key to the smooth operation of our contemporary education institutions."[32] Describing in great detail his pride and commitment to its widespread operation

---

[31]"Excerpts From the President's Special Message to Congress on Education," The New York Times, March 4, 1970, 28.

[32]"Accountability in Education." Teacher's College Record, Vol. 73, No.3 February, 1972, 344.

within the U. S. Office of Education, Marland proudly spoke of its efforts to establish management objectives but warned that this was

> the very first and relatively modest step in the management by objectives process. Once large objectives have been hammered out, each must be broken into specific and carefully defined sub-objectives. Accountability is implicit from day to day and from month to month as all echelons in the Office of Education focus their energies on the objective and its sub-objectives and perform the various tasks which lead to their completion.[33]

Calling for a "science of evaluation," Marland speculated (frighteningly so, to us) on the future of accountability.

> Indeed, within our time-perhaps within the next ten years there could well be a nationwide accounting process or institution which would act like a certified public accountant in business, objectively assessing the success and failure of our schools and reporting the findings to the public .... How productively are our teachers being used .... is the professor using his time and talents in such a way as to change the lives of his students -- and how many? These are pertinent questions of accountability and as our schools and colleges face economic crisis, the questions become even more crucial.[34]

---

[33] Ibid. 340 For a unique account of centralization decentralization theory of public organizations, See: Herbert Kaufman's article "Administration Decentralization and Political Power," Public Administration Review, Jan/Feb. 1969 Vol 24 #1 pp. 3-15. For an almost wholly descriptive look at what we like to call the "revolving, reformist administrative shell game" or what Kaufman views as the cyclical nature of the politics of public administration. In effect, administration can "roll with the punches" or "scores an early knockout" but still stays in control of the fight.

[34] Ibid. 344.

His concern with the application of business/efficiency management technology to an increased teacher productivity clearly placed Marland on the ideological side of those political figures favoring the political/economic uses of accountability.

M. M. Gubser, Dean of the College of Education at the University of Arizona, described one of the more open displays of the use of accountability for political purposes. Ultraconservatives had gained power in the Arizona State Department of Education and promoted a system of instructional accountability in order to indoctrinate students into right-wing political and economic ideas. The Arizona Board appointed "basic goals commissions" whose goals were to "be used as criteria for statewide text and supplementary book selection and for 'deletion of offensive and controversial passages' in present instructional materials."[35] To make certain that teachers did not deviate from the goals and behavioral objectives of the state-mandated curriculum, the state board of education approved a performance recertification based on performance testing.

An attack on political/academic freedom was accomplished under a "smokescreen" of accountability, and Gubser predicted that

> It may be the beginning of a national trend. California's Governor Ronald Reagan, in a recent address, cited Arizona's developing educational situation as a model for his and other states. The nationally syndicated ultraconservative radio program, Lifeline, sponsored by oil millionaire H. L. Hunt, has urged

---

[35] "Accountability as a Smokescreen for Political Indoctrination in [illegible]," [illegible], September [illegible], p. [illegible].

> school partons throughout the country to press for legislation and a curriculum patterned after that adopted in Arizona. In Georgia a situation remarkably simillar to Arizona's has developed over the past year. Texas [and numerous other states] has now legislated performance-based teacher education and criterion-referenced instruction.[36]

We fully share Gubser's concerns and fear the possibility of other forms of socio/political oppression under the guise of accountability.

There are numerous other examples of the economic and political uses of the accountability movement in education. The extent of such political endoresement is diverse. Accountability advocates from the President of these United States to the local politican or businessman are often fiscal conservatives, not known for their support of progressive social legislation, and are more interested in maintaining the status quo than with initiating change. But politicans and administrators of a more liberal persuasion are among the ranks of those pushing accountability. They are cognizant of the benefits derived from the socio/economic stability promised by accountability and they often become the leading spokesman for an essentially conservative reactionary movement.

Our examination of the accountability movement has led us to the conclusion that external economic and political forces provide the main thrust behind the movement and that these forces have as their primary goal holding down mounting educational costs at all levels of education while at the same time, supporting the status quo of the economic and political system and all its attendant inequities.

---

[36] Ibid 65.

Wayne Urban[37] provides, we think, the best critical analysis of the "foundations of accountability" when he clearly delineates the movement on two different levels 1) educational policy which involves political and economic forces external to the educational process itself and 2) educational methodology. Criticizing Olmstead[38] for not being consistent in distinguishing between the two, Urban maintains that political and economic forces best explain the basic foundations of accountability and shows where these forces were at work in the implementation of "accountability" schemes in 19th century Victorian England, America in the 1920's, as well as the present movement. Referring to Marvin Levit's article "The Ideology of Accountability in Schooling,"[39] Urban says that the accountabilists,by concentrating on narrow objectives and means, accept the present social order as a given and do not consider the relationship between school success and economic class. Urban then summarizes the central ideas in O'Connor's article on "Fiscal Crisis of the State."[40] 1) contemporary Capitalism's fusion of economic and political systems. 2) the state, at all levels, undertakes policies to enhance corporate profits 3) the state, in the role of subsidizer of corporate capital, coupled with rising wage demands by state employees and a tax payers revolt, has created a crisis in state budgets.

---

[37]A paper presented to the American Educational Studies Association at the AACTE Convention, Chicago, Illinois, February 22, 1973 by Wayne J. Urban, Associate Professor, Educational Foundations Department, Georgia State University, Atlanta.

[38]Richard Olmstead, Review of Every Kid a Winner; Accountability in Education by Leon Lessinger in Harvard Educational Review, XLII, August, 1972, pp. 425-429.

[39]Educational Studies, Vol.III, Fall, 1972, 133-40.

[40]James O'Connor, Socialist Revolution No. 1-2, January, February, 1970 and March-April 1970. pp. 12-54. and 34-94.

Building on O'Connor's analysis, Urban then concludes that accountability, in education, is an attempt to raise teacher productivity in order to meet this crisis. We concurr with Urban's analysis and argue that accountability is more an economic and political issue than a pedagogical one and therefore teachers must focus there collective efforts on the former issue in order that they may best defend themselves from a real threat posed to them by the movement.

Accountabilists know that saving money can best be accomplished by maintaining or reducing the highest accelerating cost of education, teacher's salaries. Accountability is the vehicle that has been chosen for such a task by government agencies and officals, legislatures, and school boards-many of whom have been loath to spend funds on education in recent times. But accountability is designed not only to reduce growing education costs; it has a concomitant purpose the halting and then reduction of the rise of the collective power of teachers and the curtailment of any possibility of teacher's moving in the direction of their own self-management. And self-management,we believe, is the direction in which teacher's must go in order for them to prevent a deepening of their present state of alienation.

Proponents of accountability are also fond of expounding on the"quality control" aspects of accountability,[41] but as we have suggested earlier expanding hierarchical bureaucratization is incompatible with quality work. Indeed as we made clear in Part II of this paper, it is highly probable, especially for pro-

---

[41]For a "1984 discussion" of this see: "Quality Control in the Public Schools," Elizabeth C. Wilson, Educational Technology, October, 1971, 25-29.

fessionals, that such change will only serve to further alienate teachers from their work and hence lower the quality of work being done. To paraphrase Richard Goodwin, "a truly rigorous system of quality control in an organizational structure as exists in most public education, would assume the dimensions of a subordinate bureaucracy which would add to the deficiencies of that form to the incapacities received through the umbilical."[42]

Accountability, we believe, is an attempt to apply mechanical solutions to a complex social institution, the school. It is an emerging gigantic power scheme designed to prespecify goals that are usually simplistic,unreal to the learner's natural learning environment, restrictive to the learner,and empirically unverifiable.[43] The main purposes of prespecifying goals are to rigidly control what teachers will do in the classroom and, more importantly, to control the overall economic and political considrations of the affairs of the schools although it is alleged that all those involved in the educational process will be involved in formulating goals, this is only a diversionary tactic to give teachers, parents, etc. a false sense of control over educational decision-making. The higher echelons of authority will ultimately make the important economic and political, as well as pedagogical,decisions facing the schools.[44]

---

[42]Goodwin, Part III, 69.

[43]We have spoken often of narrowness and superficiality that are almost always associated with the kind of educational assessments that we find in standardized and "objective" tests. With accountability, as presently conceived, there is good reason to believe that the number of tests given and behavioral objectives written will spread rapidly much like the frantic wandering of a bull elk in rut-without regard to content, conditions, problems, or purposes.

[44]Until the bureaucratic machinery that is responsible for implementing all this is running in smooth, self-perpetuating rhythm, we will be fully underway to another "educational Vietnam" which will "clamor for total involvement, which will resist de-esclation and from which we may later find it impossible to make any honorable withdrawal." See: Richard Ulin's excellent short piece "Behavioral Objectives: Vietnam for the English Curriculum," NEATE Leaflet, Vol. 70 No. 1, February, 1971, Eric No. ED05122Z, for a further look at a cogent analogy.

Accountability, we think, can only lead to a much more rigid hierarchy than already exists in the schools and, by extrapolating from our previous model, it will likely lead to an increase in whatever alienation from their work teachers now experience. Although teachers will be given the opportunity to develop and implement goals for students, administrators will do the same for teachers, and likewise school boards for administrators. The same kind of reporting from a lower level to the next highest level along a vertical hierarchical structure will become even more rigidly adhered to than already exists in modern school bureaucracies. School systems would become organized even more like large corporations wherein each subordinate is held directly responsible to his immediate superior up and down the hierarchical ladder until there is a web of accountability in which everyone is rigidly controlling someone else. But the real control, the "ultimate control," will remain at the top. Any illusion of control by teachers will be just that.

The writings of Lessinger and similar advocates of accountability are contributing to essentially an attempt to convert teachers into mere technocrats requiring them to give priority to a restless pursuit of efficiency[45] and productivity. But such a pursuit can take on all the trappings of a modern "scientific mysticism," and as Richard Goodwin has stated,

> The rational pursuit of a mystical idea is not rational, however, and if it is carried far enough, it loses whatever reason it once claimed ... [and that] whatever scientific reason expands its claim of authority to include the social process and is then carried to its logical conclusion, scientific

---

[45]See our prior discussion of the term "efficiency" in this paper.

reason becomes a form of secular mysticism.[46]

Accountability has as its central core an organizational logic which emphasizes economy, modernization, and exterm systemization. Teachers are burdened with rigid techniques "objective"data, inflexible management and evaluative procedures. But we believe that "newspeak" vocabulary, the technocratic "overkill," the frantic stressing of input, "objective" output, the increasing fragmentation of knowledge are really power-masking vapidities which try to conceal education's servant relationship to the overall transaction of the economic production process. If successfully implemented, we believe the accountability movement would result in a systematic oppressive mechanistic control system over public school teachers and would render teachers more alienated from their work than is presently the case.

---

[46]Although Goodwin is referring to America's holy war in Vietnam here, the same can be said of those who are working on accountability as the answer to equal educational opportunity. There are those who know perfectly well what the real purposes of accountability are, however, and we can only hope the educational research equivalent of a Daniel Ellsberg will soon emerge from one of the universities' education think tanks. See: "The American Condition. Part I, pp 51,53. For another exposition of this as it relates to educational research, see: Don Martin and Robert Morgart, "Recent Trends in Anti-Egalitarian Research: Some Considerations of the Possible Effects Upon Equal Educational Opportunity for Minorities," AERA paper, New Orleans, February, 1973.

V. CONCLUSION: WHAT IS TO BE DONE/AN EXAMINATION OF THE POSSIBILITIES OF TEACHER SELF-MANAGEMENT IN THE SCHOOLS

Having examined conceptualizations of bureaucracy and alienation, looked at some of the recent research on alienation, and explored the possible ramifications that the accountability movement might engender vis-a-vis teachers, bureaucracy and work alienation, we can now outline some conclusions of our study and offer some possible means of resolving the more blatant perversions of the meaning of work and everyday life that seem to be consequences of the "tall" hierarchical organization.

Paul Blumberg states that, "There is hardly a study in the entire literature which fails to demonstrate that satisfaction in work is enhanced or that other generally acknowledged beneficial consequences accrue from a genuine increase in workers' decision-making power. Such consistency of findings, we submit, is rare in social research. (But) it is not really difficult to explain why participation "works;" it is almost a matter of common sense that men will take greater pride and pleasure in their work if they are allowed to participate in shaping the policies and decisions which affect that work."[1] And most research tells us that this applies all the moreso to those workers so designated as professionals. This delineating relationship with work tends to operate in a dialectical fashion; that is, the "participating worker is an involved worker, for his job becomes an extension of himself and by his decisions he is creating his work, modifying and regulating it. As he is more involved in his work, he becomes more committed to it,

---

[1] Blumberg (1973), p. 123

and, being more committed, he naturally derives more satisfaction from it."[2] As Argyris points out, the authoritarian hierarchical organization subverts the creation and sustenance of a mature adult personality. The hierarchical chain of command renders the worker a passive object in the formation of his own life; it can negate many facets of "Becoming," and especially in the case of teachers, provide an example of structural (work) passivity that will undoubtedly have a similar socializing effect on students.

Even Peter Drucker states that, "The knowledge-worker (as he terms teachers and others in similar types of work) is not productive under the spur of fear; only self-motivation and self-direction can make him productive. He has to be achieving in order to produce at all."[3] Though Drucker says that the knowledge worker is the "successor to yesterday's skilled worker" (which suggests that even a conservative managerial scientist views teachers as having working class status rather than as full-fledged professionals), he is upset because "we cannot truly define, let alone measure, productivity for most knowledge work."[4] And to seemingly further contradict his position on accountability, Drucker tells us that "Achievement for

---

2 Ibid., p. 130.

3 Drucker, p. 176; This seems to be contradictory to Drucker's statements on accountability which we previously mentioned, and indeed, we believe that it is contradictory - but given Drucker's orientation to the inherent rights of "management," the managerial prerogative, it is not surprising that he sees nothing self-contradictory in this. Indeed Drucker sees nothing wrong with the corporate hierarchical system. For him, the only fault lies in "unenlightened" management within the structure - not the structure itself.

4 Drucker, p. 177.

the knowledge worker is even harder to define. No one but the knowledge worker himself can come to grips with the question of what in work, job performance, social status, and pride constitutes the personal satisfaction that makes a knowledge worker feel that he contributes, that he performs, that he serves his values, and that he fulfills himself."[5] Considering the source, this is a statement of considerable weight for our argument against "tall" hierarchy and for self-management. Indeed, Drucker points out that, "The shift in the structure and character of work has created a demand that work produce more than purely economic benefits. To make a living is no longer enough. Work also has to make a life."[6]

Clearly, then, there are ample arguments for participatory decision-making and increased job autonomy for teachers - and yet the spectre of increasing hier-

---

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid., p. 179 (our emphasis)

7 For further reference to first-rate studies which argue for self-management, we direct the reader to: (1) Michael Harmon's brilliant essay, "Social Equity and Organization Man: Motivation and Organizational Democracy" in which Harmon argues that "commitment to internal organizational democracy must be unequivocal rather than contingent upon empirical evidence demonstrating that organizational democracy (or participative management) leads to greater productivity, efficiency or even organizational loyalty." p. 12. Using Rawl's Theory of Justice as his normative justification, he states that hierarchical bureaucracy is incompatible with a Kantian view of justice. "Justice as fairness implies a commitment to internal organizational democracy that is unequovical." p. 15. While admitting that there are bound to be risks in a changeover to internal organizational democracy, he concludes that, "The concept of social equality simply does not square with the... premises on which the...practice of (bureaucratic) administration (has) for so many years been based...if social equity is to be elevated to a central position among our values..., then a serious rethinking is required about the...appropriate structure and distribution of power within public organizations." p. 17. (2) "The Dialectical Organization: An Alternative to Bureaucracy" by Orion White in "Alienation, Decentralization and Participation: A Symposium." (3) "The American Condition" by Richard Goodwin, 1974. (4) The totality of Paul Blumberg's

archicalization in the form of the accountability movement now hovers over public education like a suffocating smog. Within most present school bureaucracies, teachers have little freedom to be truly innovative or creative. To paraphrase David Selden, if teachers are to be imaginative, creative and effective, they must have the autonomy to be so. If administrations were really serious about increasing teaching effectiveness, they would see the need for shared decision-making, lessened work loads and smaller classes.[8] Seldon indicates that the hierarchical form most school organizations now exhibit reduces teaching effectiveness, increases teacher frustration, reduces teacher self-concept, and increases feelings of powerlessness and statuslessness - in other words such structure likely leads to increased teacher work alienation.[9] He believes that the teacher work-week "emphasizes

---

7(con't)
excellent Industrial Democracy. (5) Michael Smith's essays, "Alienation and Bureaucracy: The Role of Participatory Administration," (1971) and "Self-fulfillment in a Bureaucratic Society." (6) Books and articles by Jenkins, Job Power; Hunnius, et al, Worker's Control: A Reader of Labor and Social Change; Garson "Toward a Bill of Rights for Working People: On Public Policy for Self-Management," "Definitions and Distinctions Pertaining to Work Democratization," and "Staff Conflict, Organizational Bureaucracy and Teacher Satisfaction;" Vanek, The Participatory Economy; Vroom, "Industrial Social Psychology" and Management and Motivation; Phillips, People, Participation and Policy; and Thayer, An End to Hierarchy! An End to Competition!.

8 Selden, p. 1.

9 Ibid., p. 3.

the fact that elementary and secondary school teachers have more nearly the status of production employees than that of professionals (and that) teachers are, in effect, hourly workers hooked into an educational assembly line in a manner that directly conflicts with genuine teaching effectiveness."[10] Indeed, there are many indications of the possibility of a downward-spiraling vicious circle in the authoritarian bureaucratic situation, if as Seldon argues, the basic receptivity of pupils to learning probably has much to do with the realities of teacher's feelings about their work.

To extrapolate, a decrease in effectiveness in teaching probably leads to an increase in job frustration and dissatisfaction which can lead to an increase in teacher authoritarianism which, in turn, can lead to both a hierarchical authoritarian union (evidence the UFT of Albert Shanker) and an individual etiolation about attempting to change a dehumanizing work situation.[11] And an authoritarian union will probably put only a minimum of effort, if any, into trying to change the overall structure of the work organization, but rather will put almost all its efforts into gaining higher salaries and wage-related fringe benefits. An AFT/NEA under an Albert Shanker, would undoubtedly neglect what could be the real work of education - critical learning - and would push for a UAW scheme of "higher wages,

---

[10] Ibid., pp. 2, 3.

[11] Selden, p. 4; Also see Sheppard and Herrick, p. xxix and pp. 96-99. They argue that only the cynical or those who have a special interest in not seeing the structure of work change (like Richard Gerstenberg, Edwin Gott, George Meany and Albert Shanker) say that all men need is a job and some income security. As they point out from their extensive research, "job security is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for low work alienation...the least alienated workers have variety, autonomy, and responsibility on the job."

thirty years and out." Meanwhile, the various cognitive learning problems that even the most callow have identified by now, would continue to grow worse. As Seldon contends, educational success cannot be accomplished by administrative fiat, whether from a superintendent of schools or an Albert Shanker. It can only be accomplished by making the job of teaching intrinsically rewarding - hence more effective - than it is now.[12]

John Stuart Mill saw bureaucracy as a regularized ordering of human life which could diminish both creative thinking and self-direction.[13] Mill contended that, "Faculties like perception, judgment, discriminative feeling, mental activity and even moral preference are exercized only in making a choice."[14] That is, when one has a share in the decision-making power for what one does, then one's innate human sensitivities are obviously nurtured and heightened.

Smith points out that in most public schools, several potential pathologies conspire to retard the growth of those human sensibilities about which Mill speaks. He says that "the foremost pathology which denies teachers and students an open and creative work environment is a matter of underlying philosophy - the commitment to efficiency "which makes the school an "output factory" rather than a critical learning center.[15] "Quantitative indicators replace qualitative concern for

---

12 Selden, p. 10.

13 Smith, "Alienation and Bureaucracy", p. 659.

14 Mill, p. 187.

15 Smith, p. 660.

children...and the routinization of teaching practices adds to the denuding of the learning process."[16] The typical bureaucratic reward system encourages conformity not innovation. In addition to encouraging cautious conformity to the conventional wisdom embodied in standardizes exams, this type of reward system discourages teachers from developing important talents which otherwise might be regarded as criteria for advancement in their work.[17] As Mill stated, "a state which dwarfs its men in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands... will find that with small men, no great thing can be accomplished."[18]

We would argue then, that if there is to be any real change toward both a qualitatively and quantitatively better working/learning atmosphere in the schools, and if the conditions that seem to foster teacher alienation are to be alleviated, then the public schools must become functioning examples of a democratic environment. This means that teachers would be involved in every decision-making process which affected their lives within the school. This would provide a working example for students and would, hopefully, act as a conduit towards self-management programs in the community and the society as a whole. In fact, efforts at self-management in the factory or office could in dialectical fashion act as a stimulus for more self-management in the schools.[19]

---

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid.

18 Mill, p. 250.

19 See Ignacio Gotz's essay on changing the present organizational structure of schooling, ""On Man and Schooling," especially pp. 93-94, 97-98.

This obviously entails a prescription for considerable alteration in the way many of us perceive and function in our work roles. Yet if we in teacher education institutions and the public school system are truly about what we say we are, then such a change isn't really so radical after all.

Before this kind of change toward a democratic self-management of schools can come about, however, teachers, administrators, students and people within the communities must recognize that such a democratic work order is possible, practicable and desirable. This means that teachers would have to become aware of alternatives in the organization of work and be able to act on this awareness.

One way of beginning or feeding into this process of political consciousness would be for schools of education, teacher unions and teacher centers to "demystify" as Freire says, the present work order.[20] Demystification would mean providing both a knowledge of alternatives to the present order and a critical understanding of how one comes to reify one's working milieu. It would also entail a consideration of the ways in which the knowledge of alternatives can be applied in order to effect change toward those alternatives. Hierarchical bureaucracy in the schools must be seen for what it is - inefficient, ineffective and stultifying for human emotional and intellectual growth.

Knowing alternatives and looking at strategies for effecting them is not enough, however. Schools of education and teacher unions must provide a democratic

---

20 By political consciousness, we mean an overall change of the total social-economic structure and not simply working for political reforms which won't really change the distribution of power or the overall structure. As Richard Goodwin points out, our problems cannot be subdued by simple repairs or modifications (p. 86, Part 3, Goodwin). See Goodwin't further elaboration of this in Part 3, pp. 86-91.

atmosphere themselves. Classrooms, the organization of the unions, and the administration of schools of education must be models of democratic decision-making and self-management.[21] What I am saying here is that we should be cleaning our own houses so that we might provide a valid and "authentic" impetus for change for public school teachers. Theodore Brameld says that -

> Schools of education...should set the pace for self-fulfilling prophecies of the goals of democracy to which they already pay more or less explicit allegiance. I refer especially to the very great need for fully experiencing not just verbalizing, the...ideal of participatory democracy. Certainly prospective teachers who are to set examples of democratic values and behavior for students and communities should participate continually in planning every type of curriculum...and in authoritative not merely advisory policy making. Most professional educators have as yet made only token gestures in these directions. Typical institutions for teachers are severely hampered in the accomplishment of their professed objectives by line-staff pyramids of control...In short, only as thoroughly innovated policies express in practice the full meaning of participatory democracy in theory, can schools of education themselves hope to provide models for a democratic future.[22]

Teacher unions must also provide a decentralized, "flattened" organizational structure which is easily accessible and amenable to participatory democracy. (i.e., as much decision-making involvement as is possible by the maximum amount of members will into collective action. This, of course, would argue against the "highly centralized, bureaucratic, machine-type of organization"[23] that Al Shanker

---

21 For some very salient points on working for organizational change, we refer the reader to Gregg and Van Maanen's excellent essay on organizational guerilla strategies, "The Realities of Education as a Prescription for Organizational Change" (1973).

22 Brameld, Theodore. The Climactic Decades, Praeger, 1970, pp. 37-38.

23 Tapper, Owen. Teachers for Democracy Newsletter, January, 1974.

would like to build in the AFT. Indeed, Shanker seems to be hell-bent on aping the AFL's hierarchy which is at least as authoritarian and undemocratic in its organizational structure as is U.S. Steel. Shanker's authoritarian organizational blueprint for a Shanker-led AFT was outlined by Thomas Hobart, President of the NEA-AFT New York State United Teachers who stated that, "(The question) is whether we have a decentralized organization that tries to accommodate everybody or a centralized organization that can focus on long-term goals. We are running a large corporation and it has to be administered (like one).[24] The nondemocratic union forms that have been and would be instituted by an Albert Shanker are clearly anathema to any possibility of teacher self-management. We believe that Shanker provides a clear threat to the development of any autonomy and participatory decision-making for teachers - and thus critical learning in the schools - and is, in many ways, as much a danger of education as Richard Nixon.

David Montgomery has pointed out that,

> Those unions most likely to be amenable to managerial authority in the work process were those unions with little internal democracy.[25]

Therefore, the organization of teacher unions must be geared toward democratic self-management - and in turn the unions must begin to challenge the substantial residual authority of administrations and school boards to direct

---

24 New York Times, March 24, 1974.

25 Montgomery, David, et al, "Workers and the Control of Production." Radical America, Vol. 7, No. 6, November/December, 1973.

teacher's work. Clearly teacher unions have fewer barriers to deal with in bringing about internal self-democratization and self-management at the schools than do other unions which must deal with private corporations. But up to this point the teachers unions have not even challenged the basic functions of the school which is preparing people to fit into the economic bureaucracy. And these inherently dehumanizing aspects of the process of teachers' work must be challenged if self-management is to be infused into the teachers' workplace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization, New York: Wiley, 1964.

Arnstine, Donald. "Freedom and Bureaucracy in the Schools." Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling, Vernon F. Haubrich, editor, Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (NEA), 1971.

Aronowitz, Stanley. False Promises, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Bell, Daniel. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society, New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Blau, Peter M. and Marshall W. Meyer. Bureaucracy in Modern Society, New York: Random House, 1956.

Boyan, Norman J. "Emergent Role of Teacher and Authority Structure of School," Journal of Secondary Education, Vol. 42, November, 1967, pp. 291-304.

Callahan, Raymond. Education and the Cult of Efficiency, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Caplow, Theodore. Principles of Organizations, New York: Harcourt Brace and Jovanovich, 1964.

Crozier, Michael. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Dahl, Robert. "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, Vol. 2, July, 1957, pp. 202-203.

Dubin, Robert. Human Relations in Administration, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Eisenstadt, S. N. Tradition, Change and Modernity, New York: Wiley, 1973.

Ellul, Jacques. The Technological Society, New York: Vintage Books, 1964.

Etzioni, Amitai. A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Gamson, William. Power and Discontent, Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1968.

Gibson, James L., John M. Ivancevich and James H. Donnelly, Jr. Organizations: Structure, Processes, Behavior, Dallas: Business Publications, Inc., 1973.

Gibson, James L. Readings in Organizations: Structure, Processes, Behavior, Dallas: Business Publications, Inc., 1973.

Hall, Richard. Organizations: Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Israel, Joachim. Alienation: From Marx to Modern Sociology, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Jacobs, T. O. Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations, Alexandria, Virginia: Human Resources Research Organization, 1971.

Karier, Clarence, Paul Violas and Joel Spring. Roots of Crisis, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Katz, Michael B. Class, Bureaucracy and Schools, New York: Praeger, 1971.

March, James G. and Herbert A. Simon. Organizations, New York: Wiley, 1958.

Merton, Robert K. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Reader in Bureaucracy, Merton, Gray, Hockey and Selvin, editors, New York: Free Press, 1952.

Michels, Robert. Political Parties, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1962.

Milgram, Stanley. Obedience to Authority, New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Mouzelis, Nicos P. Organizations and Bureaucracy, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Roethlisberger, Fritz J. and William J. Dickson. Management and the Worker, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Russell, Betrand. Authority and the Individual, Boston: Beacon Press, 1949.

Seaburg, Stanley. "Abolish the Caste System!" The Clearing House, Vol. 42, October, 1967, pp. 67-72.

Seashore, S. E. and D. G. Bowers. "Changing the Structure and Functioning of an Organization," Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, Monograph No. 33, 1963.

Seeman, M. "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, No. 6, 1959, pp. 783-791.

Spring, Joel. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State, Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Social Psychology of the Work Place, Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1966.

Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Control in Organizations, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Taylor, Frederick W. Scientific Management, New York: Harper, 1911.

Thayer, Frederick C. An End to Hierarchy! An End to Competition! New York: New Viewpoints, 1973.

Thompson, James D. Organizations in Action, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Tyack, David B. "City Schools: Centralization of Control at the Turn of the Century," Building the Organizational Society, Jerry Israel, editor, New York: Free Press, 1972.

Vroom, Victor. Work and Motivation, New York: Wiley, 1964.

Wamsely, Gary. "Power and the Crisis of the Universities," Power in Organizations, Mayer N. Zald, editor, Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970.

Weber, Max. Theory of Social and Economic Organization, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Whyte, William H. Organization Man, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aiken, Michael and Jerald Hage. "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis," American Sociological Review, Vol. 31, August, 1966, pp. 497-507.

Anderson, Barry. "The Bureaucracy-Alienation Relationship in Secondary Schools," AERA Paper, March, 1970, ERIC #ED053-445.

Anderson, Barry. "School Bureaucratization and Alienation from High School," Sociology of Education, Vol. 46, 1973, pp. 315-334.

Anderson, Barry. "Socio-Economic Status of Students and School Bureaucratization," Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring, 1971, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 12-24.

Anderson, Barry. "Reactions to a Study of Bureaucracy and Alienation," Social Forces, Vol. 49, No. 4, June, 1971, pp. 614-530.

Aptheker, Bettina. "Alienation," The Academic Rebellion in the United States, Citadel Press, 1972, pp. 127-148.

Aronowitz, Stanley. False Promises: The Shaping of the American Working Class Consciousness, 1972.

Avineri, Schlomo. The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx, Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Barakat, H. I. "Alienation from the School System: Its Dynamics and Structure," Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1966, ERIC #014-815.

Bayard, Tom, et al. "Towards a Fully Self-Managed Industrial Sector in the United States," Cornell University, January, 1974.

Belasco, James A. and Joseph Alutto. "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1972, pp. 44-58.

Benello, C. George and Dimitrios Roussopoulos. The Case for Participatory Democracy. Viking Press, 1970.

Bennis, Warren. Beyond Bureaucracy, McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Bernstein, Richard J. Praxis and Action, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.

Best, Fred. The Future of Work, Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Bickford, Hugh L. and Arthur G. Neal. "Alienation and Social Learning: A Study of Students in a Vocational Training Center," Sociology of Education, Spring, 1969, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 141-153.

Blauner, Robert. Alienation and Freedom, University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Bonjean, Charles M. and Michael D. Grimes. "Some Ideas in the Study of Bureaucracy and Alienation," Social Forces, Vol. 49, No. 4, June, 1971, pp. 622-630.

Bonjean, Charles M. and Michael D. Grimes. "Bureaucracy and Alienation: A Dimensional Approach," Social Forces, March, 1970, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 365-373.

Bowles, Sam and Herb Gintis. "Alienation and Capitalist Production," Harvard University, 1973.

Brameld, Theodore. The Climactic Decades, Praeger, 1970.

Brown, Bruce. Marx, Freud and the Critique of Everyday Life, Monthly Review Press, 1973.

Burbach, Harold J. "An Empirical Study of Powerlessness Among High School Students, The High School Journal, April, 1972, Vol. 55, No. 7, pp. 343-354.

Callahan, Raymond. Education and the Cult of Efficiency, University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Carnoy, Martin, editor. Schooling in a Corporate Society, McKay, 1972.

Carnoy, Martin. "Notes on the Demand for Labor," Stanford University, December, 1973.

Carpenter, Harrell H. "Formal Organizational Structural Factors and Perceived Job Satisfaction of Classroom Teachers," Administrative Science Quarterly, December, 1971, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 460-465.

Chung, Ki-Suck. "Teacher-Centered Management Style of Public School Teachers and Job Satisfaction of Teachers," AERA Paper, March, 1970, ERIC ##D042-259.

Clark, John P. "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System," American Sociological Review, December, 1959, Vol. 24, pp. 849-852.

Coover, Robert. The Universal Baseball Association, Inc., J. Henry Waugh, Prop., New American Library, 1968.

Coughlan, Robert J. and Ernest Froemel. "A Comparison Between Two Standardized Measures of Teacher Morale," AERA Paper, February, 1971, ERIC #ED050-171.

Coughlan, Robert J. "Job Satisfaction in Relatively Closed and Open Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 7, No. 2, Spring, 1971, pp. 40-59.

Coughlan, Robert J. "Social Structure in Relatively Closed and Open Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring, 1970, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 14-35.

Dean, Dwight, Jr. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, October, 1961, Vol. 26, pp. 753-758.

Easton, Lloyd and Kurt Guddat. Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society, Doubleday, 1967.

Finifter, Ada. Alienation and the Social System, John Wiley, 1972.

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Herder and Herder, 1970.

Garson, G. David. "Radical Issues in the History of the American Working Class," Politics and Society, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1972.

Garson, G. David. "Toward a Bill of Rights for Working People: On Public Policy for Self-Management," Tufts University, January, 1974.

Garson, G. David. "Definitions and Distinctions Pertaining to Work Democratization," Tufts University, November, 1973.

Gerhart, Ed and Cecil Miskel. "Staff Conflict, Organizational Bureaucracy and Teacher Satisfaction," AERA Paper, April 6, 1972, ERIC #064-241.

Gintis, Herbert. "Alienation and Power," Review of Radical Political Economics, Vol. 4, No. 5, 1972.

Gintis, Herbert and Sam Bowles. "The Contradictions of Liberal Educational Reform," Harvard University, March, 1973.

Goodman, Paul. People or Personnel, Random House, 1968.

Goodwin, Richard. "The American Condition," The New Yorker, January 21, 28 and February 4, 1974.

Gorz, Andre. Strategy for Labor, Beacon Press, 1967.

Gotz, Ignacio. "On Man and His Schooling," Educational Theory, Vol. 24, No. 1, Winter, 1974, pp. 85-98.

Gregg, Roy G. and John Van Maanen. "The Realities of Education as a Prescription for Organizational Change," Public Administration Review, Vol. 33, No. 6, November/December, 1973, pp. 522-532.

Harmon, Michael M. "Social Equity and Organizational Man: Motivation and Organizational Democracy," Public Administration Review, January/February, 1974, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 11-18.

Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. New American Library, 1965.

Howton, F. William. Functionaries, Quadrangle Books, 1969.

Hunnius, Gerry, G. David Garson and John Case. Worker's Control: A Reader of Labor and Social Change, Random House, 1973.

Israel, Joachim. Alienation: From Marx to Modern Sociology, Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Jacoby, Henry. The Bureaucratization of the World, University of California Press, 1973.

Jenkins, David. Job Power, Doubleday, 1973.

Josephson, Eric and Mary Josephson, editor. Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society, Dell, 1962.

Katz, Michael. Class, Bureaucracy and Schools, Praeger, 1971.

Kirsch, Barbara A. and Joseph Lengermann. "An Empirical Test of Robert Blouner's Ideas on Alienation in Work as Applied to Different Type Jobs in a White Collar Setting," Sociology and Social Research, January, 1972, Vol. 56, No. 4, pp. 180-184.

Lichtheim, George. From Marx to Hegel, Seabury, 1971.

Lystad, Mary H. "Social Alienation: A Review of Current Literature," The Sociological Quarterly, Winter, 1972, Vol. 13, pp. 90-113.

Mandel, Ernest and George Novack. The Marxist Theory of Alienation, Pathfinder, 1973.

Marx, Karl. The Grundrisse (translated by David McLellan), Harper and Row, 1971.

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. Selected Works, International Publishers, 1968.

May, Rollo. Power and Innocence, W. W. Norton, 1972.

Meszaros, Istvan. Marx's Theory of Alienation, Harper and Row, 1970.

Meyers, Russell W. "School System Bureaucratization and Teachers' Sense of Power," AERA Paper, April 6, 1972, ERIC #ED064-231.

Miller, George A. "Professionals in Bureaucracy: Alienation Among Industrial Scientists and Engineers," American Sociological Review, October, 1967, Vol. 32, No. 5, pp. 755-768.

Miner, Adam B. "Change in Student Attitudes Toward Bureaucratic Role Prescriptions During the 1960's," Administrative Science Quarterly, September, 1971, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 351-364.

Mohr, Lawrence. "Organizational Technology and Organizational Structure," Administrative Science Quarterly, December, 1971, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 444-459.

Montgomery, David, et al. "Workers and the Control of Production," Radical America, Vol. 7, No. 6, November/December, 1973.

Moore, Barrington. Reflections on the Causes of Human Misery, Beacon Press, 1972.

Morgart, Robert, Gregory Mihalik and Don Martin. "Can/Should the Schools Change the Social Order - The Problem of the Professional Proletariat - The American Public School Teacher in the '70's," University of Pittsburgh, November, 1973.

Neal, Arthur G. and Solomon Rettig. "On the Multidimensionality of Alienation," American Sociological Review, February, 1967, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 55-64.

Odetola, T. O., et al. "Organizational Structure and Student Alienation," Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter, 1972, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 15-26.

Ollman, Bertel. Alienation, Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Ollman, Bertel. "Toward Class Consciousness Next Time: Marx and the Working Class," Politics and Society, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1972.

O'Reilly, Robert P. and William Gorth. "Alternatives to Accountability: Stool Pigeon Versus Servant and Soulmate," Conference of Educational Records Bureau, October, 1971, ERIC #ED068-517.

Parker, Stanley. The Future of Work and Leisure, Praeger, 1971.

Phillips, Sandra and Louise Taylor. People, Participation and Policy, Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations, 1971.

Rafalides, Madeline and Wayne K. Hoy. "Student Sense of Alienation and Pupil Control Orientation of High Schools," The High School Journal, December, 1971, Vol. 55, No. 3, pp. 101-111.

Reich, Michael, David Gordon and Richard Edwards. "A Theory of Labor Market Segmentation," American Economic Review, Vol. 63, No. 2, 1973, pp. 359-365.

Robinson, John P., Robert Athanasiou andKendra Head. Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.

Robinson, John P. and Phillip R. Shaver. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973.

Rossel, Robert D. "Autonomy in Bureaucracies," Administrative Science Quarterly, September, 1971, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 308-314.

Roszak, Theodore. The Making of a Counter Culture, Doubleday, 1969.

Roszak, Theodore. Where the Wasteland Ends, Doubleday, 1972.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. Search for a Method, Random House, 1963.

Schacht, Richard. Alienation, Doubleday, 1970.

Schaffer, Edward. "Alienation and the Sociology of Education," Educational Theory, Spring, 1970, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 121-128.

Schoff, Adam. Marxism and the Human Individual, McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Schroyer, Trent. The Critique of Domination, Braziller, 1973.

Seeman, Melvin. "On The Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work," American Sociological Review, April, 1967, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 273-285.

Seeman, Melvin. "On The Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, December, 1959, Vol. 24, pp. 783-791.

Seeman, Melvin. "The Urban Alienations: Some Dubious Theses from Marx to Marcuse," Journal of Personality and Psychology, August, 1971, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 135-143.

Selden, David. "Teacher Workload and Teacher Dropout," AFT QUEST Paper #5, 1969. ERIC #032-272.

Sennett, Richard and Jonathan Cobb. The Hidden Injuries of Class, Alfred Knopf, 1972.

Shepard, Jon. "Alienation as a Process: Work as a Case in Point," The Sociological Quarterly, Spring, 1972, Vol. 13, pp. 161-173.

Sheppard, Harold and Neal Herrick. Where Have All the Robots Gone? Macmillan, 1972.

Slater, Phillip. The Pursuit of Loneliness, Beacon Press, 1970.

Smith, Michael P. "Alienation and Bureaucracy: The Role of Participatory Administration," Public Administration Review, November/December, 1971, Vol. 31, No. 6, pp. 658-664.

Snell, Joel C. "The Urban Student: Alienation and School Participation," Urban Education, July/October, 1971, Vol. 6, No. 2/3, pp. 267-271.

Stammer, O., editor. Max Weber and Sociology Today, Harper and Row, 1971.

Svitak, Ivan. Man and His World, Dell, 1970.

Tapper, Owen. Teachers for Democracy Newsletter, January, 1974. Morgantown, West Virginia (Local 189, AFT, 753 Augusta Avenue).

Taviss, Irene. "Changes in the Form of Alienation - The 1900's vs. the 1950's," American Sociological Review, February, 1969, pp. 46-57.

Thayer, Frederick. An End to Hierarchy! An End to Competition. New Viewpoints, 1973.

Touraine, Alain. The Post Industrial Society, Random House, 1971.

Tudor, Bill. "A Specification of Relationships Between Job Complexity and Powerlessness," American Sociological Review, October, 1972, Vol. 37, pp. 595-604.

Ulin, Richard. "Behavioral Objectives: Vietnam for the English Curriculum," NEATE, February, 1971, ERIC #ED051-222.

Vanek, Jaroslav. The Participatory Economy, Cornell University Press, 1971.

Vietorisz, Thomas and Bennett Harrison. "Labor Market Segmentation: The Institutionalization of Divergence," Policy Research in Education Reprint #46, Harvard University, Center for Educational Policy Research, 1973.

Vroom, V. H. "Industrial Social Psychology," Handbook of Social Psychology, ed., by Gardner Lindsey and Elliot Aronsen, Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Vroom, Victor and Edward Deci. Management and Motivation, Penguin Books, 1970.

Wachtel, Howard. "Class, Class Consciousness and Labor Market Stratification, from The Theory of Political Economy - forthcoming.

Waldo, Dwight, ed. "Alienation, Decentralization and Participation: A Symposium," Public Administration Review, February, 1969, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 2-63.

Williams, James O. "Professionalism and Bureaucracy: Natural Conflict," NASSP Bulletin, December, 1971, No. 359, pp. 61-74.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abert, James G. "Wanted. Experiments in Reducing the Cost of Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV, No. 7, March, 1974, pp. 444-445.

Adams, Dennis M. "Some Questions Concerning Behavioral Objectives," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIII, No. 1, Spring, 1972, p. 26.

Allen, Dwight W., Eli Seifman, editors. The Teacher's Handbook, Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971.

Barro, Stephen. "An Approach to Developing Accountability Measures for the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 1, December, 1970, pp. 194-195.

Berry, Janet S. "Accountability: Can Teachers Make Progress Commitments for Individual Children?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV, No. 6, February, 1974, pp. 420-421.

Broadbelt, Samuel. "The Impact of Educational Accountability Upon Teachers and Supervisors," The High School Journal, November, 1972, pp. 55-66.

Broudy, Harry S. A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education, 1972.

Campbell, Robert E. "Accountability and Stone Soup," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIII, No. 3, November, 1971, pp. 176-178.

Carnoy, Martin. Education as Cultural Imperialism, New York: David McKay Company, 1974.

Carnoy, Martin. "Educational Change: Past and Present," Intellect, March, 1974, pp. 401-406.

Dickson, George E., Richard W. Saxe, et al. Partners for Educational Reform and Renewal: Conpetency Based Teacher Education, Individually Guided Education and Multiunit Schools, Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.

Dodl, Norman R. "Selecting Competency Outcomes for Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall, 1973, pp. 194-198.

Drucker, Peter F. "Can the Businessman Meet our Social Needs," Saturday Review of Society, Vol. 1, No. 3, April, 1973, p. 42.

Durstine, Richard M. "An Accountability Information System," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 236-238.

Dyer, Henry S. "Toward Objective Criteria of Professional Accountability in the Schools of New York City," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 206-211.

Experiment in Performance Contracting: Summary of Preliminary Results. Office of Economic Opportunity Pamphlet, February, 1972, pp. 3400-5.

"For the Record," Teachers College Record, Vol. 73, No. 3, February, 1972, pp. 333-337.

Glass, Gene V. "The Many Faces of Educational Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIII, No. 10, June, 1972, pp. 636-639.

Getz, Howard, et al. "From Traditional to Competency-Based Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LVI, No. 6, January, 1972, pp. 300-302.

Graybeal, William. "Teacher Surplus and Teacher Shortage," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIII, No. 2, October, 1971, pp. 82-85.

Graybeal, William S. Trends in Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1973-1976. National Education Association Research Division, Washington, D.C., January, 1973, pp. 1-5.

Grobman, Hulda. "Accountability for What: The Unanswered Question," Nation's Schools, Vol. 89, No. 5, May, 1972, pp. 65-88.

Guber, M. M. "Accountability as a Smoke Screen for Political Indoctrination in Arizona," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 1, September, 1973, pp. 64-65.

Hawthorne, Phyllis. Legislation by the States: Accountability and Assessment in Education, Denver, Colorado: Cooperative Accountability Project, April, 1973.

Hause, Ernest R. "The Price of Productivity: Who Pays?" Today's Education, September/October, 1973, pp. 65-59.

Houston, W. Robert. "Designing Competency-Based Instructional Systems," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall, 1973, pp. 200-203.

Howsan, Robert B. "Management of PBTE Programs," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall, 1973, pp. 213-219.

Klein, Stephen M. "The Uses and Limitations of Standardized Tests in Meeting the Demands for Accountability, UCLA Evaluation Comment, Vol. II, No. 4, January, 1971, pp. 1-7.

Landus, Jacob. "Accountability and Progress by Nomenclature: Old Ideas in New Bottles," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 8, April, 1973, p. 539.

Lessinger, Leon. "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education," Vol. LII, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 217-225.

Lessinger, Leon. Every Kid a Winner, Accountability in Education, Palo Alto, California: Science Research Associates College Division, 1970.

Lieberman, Myron. "An Overview of Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 194-195.

Lindsey, Margaret. "Performance-based Teacher Education: Examination of a Slogan," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall, 1973, pp. 180-186.

Lopez, Felix M. "Accountability in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 231-235.

Lutz, Frank W. "The Justice Effect and Teacher Oversupply," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIII, No. 8, April, 1972, pp. 517-518.

Marland, Sidney P., Jr. "New Order of Educational Research and Development," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 10, June, 1971, pp. 576-579.

Marland, Sidney P., Jr. "Accountability in Education," Teachers College Record, Vol. 73, No. 3, February, 1972, p. 339-345.

Massanari, Karl. "Performance-based Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall, 1973, p. 179.

McDonald, Frederick J., Garlie A. Foreland, "A Design for Accountability in Education," New York University Education Quarterly, Vol. IV, No. 2, Winter, 1972, pp. 7-16.

Mecklenburger, James A. "Epilogue: The Performance Contract in Gary," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 8, April, 1973, pp. 562-563.

Miller, Samuel D. "Shifting the Emphasis from Entrance to Exit: Competency-Based Programs in Teacher Education," Music Education Journal, October, 1973, pp. 64-67.

Miller, John K. "Not Performance Contracting But the OEO Experiment was a Failure," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 6, February, 1973, pp. 395-396.

Millman, Jason. "Reporting Student Progress: A Case for a Criterion-Referenced Marking System," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 226-230.

Montgomery, James. "The Teacher Surplus: Facing the Facts," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 9, May, 1973, p. 627.

Moynihan, Daniel P. "Equalizing Education: In Whose Benefit?" Public Interest, No. 29, Fall, 1972, p. 73.

Nash, Robert J. "Commitment to Competency: The New Fetishism in Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 240-243.

Nash, Robert J., Russell M. Agne, "Competency in Teacher Education: A Prop for the Status Quo?" The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXII, No. 2, Summer, 1971, pp. 147-156.

Nash, Robert J., Russel M. Agne. "The Ethos of Accountability - A Critique," Teachers College Record, Vol. 73, No. 3, February, 1972, pp. 357-370.

Nixon, Richard M. "Excerpts From the President's Special Message to Congress on Educational Reform," The New York Times, March 4, 1970, p. 28.

Ornstein, Aldan C., Harriet Talmage. "The Rhetoric and the Realities of Accountability," Today's Education, September/October, 1973, pp. 70-80.

Perrone, Vita, Warren Strandberg. "A Perspective on Accountability," Teachers College Record, Vol. 73, No. 3, pp. 347-355.

Porter, John W. "The Accountability Story in Michigan," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 2, October, 1972, pp. 98-99.

Punke, Harold H. "Educational Accountability: Sowers and Reapers," The High School Journal, May, 1972, pp. 380-395.

Ricketts, Kenneth E. "Accountability Starts With the Superintendent," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 1, September, 1973, pp. 64-65.

Rorvik, David. "Behavior Control: Big Brother Comes," Intellectual Digest, January, 1974, pp. 17-20.

Saretsky, Gary. "Every Kid a Hustler," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 10, June, 1971, pp. 595-596.

Scheffler, Israel. The Language of Education, Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1960.

Schurebel, Milton. "Educational Technology Reviews," Every Kid a Winner by Leon Lessinger, Educational Technology, October, 1970, pp. 19-20.

Shapiro, Leo J. and Evelyn Zerfoss. The Supply and Demand of Teachers and Teaching. Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1972, pp. 1-55.

Shearron, Gilbert F., Charles E. Johnson. "A CBTE Program in Action: University of Georgia," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall, 1973, pp. 187-192.

Sikula, John P. "Accountability: Some Teacher Misconceptions," The High School Journal, December, 1972, pp. 154-157.

Small, Alan A. "Accountability in Victorian England," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 7, March, 1972.

Soar, Robert S. "Accountability: Assessment Problems and Possibilities," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall, 1973, pp. 205-211.

Stake, Robert E. "Testing Hazards in Performance Contracting," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 10, June, 1971, pp. 583-589.

Sybouts, Ward. "Performance-Based Teacher Education: Does It Make a Difference?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 5, p. 300-302.

Teacher Shortage or Surplus: That is the Question. National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, Washington, D.C., June, 1972, pp. 1-25.

Thompson, Marion, et al. "Contingency Management in the Schools: How Often and How Well Does It work?" American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 11, No. 1, Winter, 1974, pp. 19-28.

Tyler, Ralph W. "Testing for Accountability," Nation's Schools, Vol. 86, No. 6, December, 1970, pp. 37-39.

White, Louise R. "PBTE in a Multi-cultural Society," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall, 1973, pp. 225-230.

Wildavsky, Aaron. "A Program of Accountability for Elementary Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LII, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 212-216.

Wilson, Elizabeth. "Quality Control in the Public Schools," Educational Technology, October, 1971, pp. 25-29.

Woodington, Donald D. "Accountability from the Viewpoint of a State Commissioner of Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, No. 2, pp. 95-97.

Woodruff, Asahel D. "PBTE, 10 Years Hence," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, Fall, 1973, pp. 238-243.

Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1974, "Accountability" (complete issue).